

"France: A ministerial decree closed all confectioners' shops on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. A decree of February 9, 1917, forbids the sale of new bread.

"Great Britain and Ireland: A Government commission has the monopoly of importing and distributing in Great Britain and Ireland all foreign wheat, maize, and rice.

"Bread must be one day old before it can be sold. It is forbidden to use milk and sugar in baking bread. The food controller has fixed the ration of bread and flour at 4 pounds per inhabitant per week.

"Italy: A decree of February 21, 1917, orders that 90 pounds of flour shall be obtained from every 100 pounds of wheat.

"A decree of December 12, 1916, enacts restrictions on the consumption of food in hotels, pensions, restaurants, cafes, dairy shops, etc., and forbids certain foods on certain days, limits the number of dishes which may be served, etc. A decree of March 10, 1917, forbids the sale of all cakes and confectionery."

[From an editorial in the London Times, Mar. 24, 1917.]

For the first time since the Crimean War the price of bread in this country is to be raised to a shilling for a 4-pound loaf. * * *

The country was led to concentrate its attention upon meatless days and potatoless days, and up till now has paid very insufficient attention to the even more pressing question of bread. * * *

If it is necessary to prescribe the number of ounces of meat which may be consumed at a meal in a hotel, as undoubtedly it is, why not rigidly limit the bread also? * * *

The teashop requires scrutiny just as much as the restaurant. * * * Three meals a day and nothing between, ought now to be the extreme limit for everybody in the land. We shall be lucky if we do not in the end get down to two meals a day.

Possibly domiciliary search for food hoards has become necessary. * * *

The food controller's suggested order touches every householder in the land, and might easily become a cause of widespread irritation. A further reduction of the sugar ration is about to be promulgated.

(Submitted by David Lubin, delegate of the United States International Institute of Agriculture, Rome.)

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, April 26, 1917, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 25, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and Eternal Spirit, we approach Thee in the faith and confidence inspired by the world's great religious teacher, that Thou art a God hearing and a God answering prayer. We need the inspiration of Thy presence moment by moment, hour by hour, as the years come and go. Guide us in the great problems which confront us in the present crisis, that we may fulfill our obligations to mankind and lead on to larger and nobler life. We thank Thee for the distinguished guests from our sister nations here to consult our leaders in this hour of trial, that we may be united in thought and purpose against a common foe. Hear us and thus guide them and us by Thy counsels. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1800. An act to amend an act approved June 29, 1906, and entitled "An act to authorize the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the District of Columbia to sell, hold, and convey certain real estate."

WILLIAM H. TOPPING.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 36 (H. Rept. No. 29).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to William H. Topping, clerk to Cyrus A. Sulloway, late a Representative from the State of New Hampshire, at the time of his death, March 11, 1917, the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

JANITORS FOR COMMITTEES.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I also submit another privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 40 (H. Rept. No. 28).

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint two janitors for committees located in the Capitol, at the rate of \$60 per month each, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, during the sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning on the 2d day of April, 1917.

Mr. MANN. Is that for the session?

The SPEAKER. It is during the session.

Mr. MANN. The first session?

Mr. PARK. The first session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I also submit another privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 66 (H. Rept. No. 27).

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be allowed an assistant clerk at the rate of \$100 per month, during the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning the 2d day of April, 1917, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this in addition to the clerk that is authorized in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for this year?

Mr. PARK. Yes, sir. It is a customary allowance, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POT] said, for his committee.

Mr. MANN. They always give it every year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Committee on Rules is not very active this session.

Mr. PARK. They are going to be very soon.

Mr. STAFFORD. I question if they will be pretty soon. I do not think there is need of an extra clerk, the Committee on Rules having no rules to present to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

E. C. ROST.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I also present the following resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 55 (H. Rept. No. 26).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to E. C. Rost, clerk to Henry T. Helgesen, late a Representative from the State of North Dakota at the time of his death, April 10, 1917, the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CLERK FOR COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I also offer another resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 63 (H. Rept. No. 25).

Resolved, That the Committee on Enrolled Bills be allowed a clerk, at the rate of \$6 per diem, during the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning the 2d day of April, 1917, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember what the practice is, but I think it ought to be an assistant clerk.

Mr. PARK. He is an assistant clerk.

Mr. MANN. The resolution does not say so.

Mr. PARK. Then I move to amend it so that it will read "assistant clerk."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman offers an amendment inserting the word "assistant."

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ATTENDANT FOR LADIES' RECEPTION ROOM.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I also present the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 43 (H. Rept. No. 24).

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint an attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-fifth Congress, at the rate of \$75 per month, beginning on the 2d day of April, 1917, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. MANN. Is that for the session or for the Congress?

Mr. PARK. It says for the Congress. She has about as much work in vacation as any other time.

Mr. MANN. If that is the case, I think she should be paid from the 4th of March.

Mr. PARK. This is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of sweet potatoes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of sweet potatoes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 3545.

Mr. MANN. Pending that, by unanimous consent, may I ask the gentleman whether, under the agreement entered into last night, the understanding is that general debate closes to-day?

Mr. DENT. No, sir; that was not the understanding. We have not reached any agreement on that subject yet.

Mr. MANN. Well, there was a question. The gentleman asked unanimous consent to have the general debate run not later than 10 o'clock to-night. That was not intended to close debate, then?

Mr. DENT. No; that was not intended to close debate then, unless we can reach an agreement during the day to that effect and the matter is again submitted to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3545, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the traditional method of raising American troops is by the volunteer system. We fought our Indian wars with Volunteers. We fought our colonial wars with Volunteers. Washington never commanded a conscript. The men who added glory to the American arms in 1812 were Volunteers. The Americans who broke the proud spirit of the veterans of the Spanish Peninsula at New Orleans were Tennessee and Kentucky Volunteers. The Mexican War was fought by men who had voluntarily given their service. They were not humble conscripts. They were not soldier-slaves, driven to the flag.

Is there any truthful man who will dare say that conscripts added anything to the undying glory that attaches to the flag of the Southern Confederacy, to the Stars and Bars? Is there a man so unmindful of our proud American traditions as that he would claim that in 1861 to 1865 any conscript contributed anything to the deeds of imperishable valor and courage that crowned the Union Armies with victory? There were no conscripts in 1898. Never down to this good day has it been proposed to place our flag in the hands of conscripts and to rest for the preservation of American honor upon men who are driven by compulsion into the ranks.

The men who propose at this time that we should commit an act are bound to give us some sound reasons for their position. It must be no mere matter of temporary convenience. It must be no mere whim. It must not be to satisfy anybody's selfish interest. It must not be for the purpose of perpetuating in this free land of a system of compulsory military service. It must have no ulterior motive. *It must have for its object the winning of this war.*

Men who take that position are bound at the outset to give us some good and satisfactory reasons for this radical change. Have Americans lost their courage? Is patriotism gone out of the land? Are we no longer free men, willing to fight for our institutions? Have we forgotten our glorious past? Have we come down at last to the worship of money and ease and selfishness?

I say it is not so. Any man who would take such a position is an unjust and libelous traducer of the fair name of our America. Any man who would impute to our people a lack of patriotism and devotion; who would say that we are less capable than the English to defend our institutions; who would say we are not as patriotic as our neighbors on the north, the Canadians; who would say that we are not able to hold up the memories and traditions that have honored this country in the past, would utter a libel on his country and his time. Surely there is none who will so befoul the time in which he lives.

We have been offered some reasons for this measure, and I want to discuss those reasons. We have been offered reasons for public consumption. We have been offered reasons to appeal to the mob with. We have been offered reasons with which corrupt newspapers may lash the unthinking into a fury. But have we been offered any reasons that should appeal to patriots and to thoughtful, sensible men? That is the question.

A PROBLEM FOR STATESMEN.

I am amazed to see men of intelligence and patriotism standing up and saying that we ought to leave all this question to the President's military advisers; that we ought to let Regular Army officers settle this matter for the American people. If it were a mere military matter, I should agree with that proposition. If it were merely a matter of how many men it takes to conduct a campaign when the campaign is laid out, if it were a matter of the best means to arm men and how they should be drilled and sent against the foe, then I would abide the opinion of some epauletted general on the subject.

But this is not a military problem. The military feature is the smallest aspect of it. It is a social question; it is an industrial question. In the big way it is not a question for soldiers. It is a question for statesmen. God grant that the American Congress can produce statesmen, enough real statesmen, to deal with a subject like this in a time like this! Are we men sent here with a commission by the people of the United States or are we contemptible cowards? Will we shift our responsibility to the shoulders of somebody else? Will we allow a lot of little editors from the back rooms of their publishing houses to dictate to us, who represent the majesty of the American people? If we are content to do that, then we may well say that some little whippersnapper of an Army officer should tell the American people what they are to do. But if we are men, and willing to meet our responsibilities as men, let us decide upon this question just as we do upon other questions, upon its merits. If we do our duty here we must deal with this matter not as one of mere military expediency but as one that touches the whole life and the vitals of the Nation. We should deal with it for ourselves like men. Let no man plead moral bankruptcy when he goes before his people.

This is much more of a social and industrial question than anything else. The people who want it—not you, gentlemen, but the people who have inspired this campaign; you know who they are—are concerned with it in its social and industrial aspects. The same ones are clamoring for conscription now that have been clamoring for it for the past two years.

Our country is now at war. We have our part to play in the terrible tragedy heretofore confined to the stage of the Old World. The vital question of the hour is how we may win the war as speedily as possible and at the least cost in blood, treasure, and American ideals.

The contest which has been going on in our country for the past two years between the conscriptionists and those who oppose that system has completely changed its aspect. The shallow arguments in favor of conscription in time of peace are no longer applicable. The pretenses that conscription is needed for its effect upon the public health, the discipline of youth, teaching respect for property, and docility to the people are now spent. Nothing that could be said on behalf of conscription in time of peace can now truthfully be said. On the other hand, every argument which has ever been made against conscription remains in effect and is stronger in the present crisis.

Although this is true, we find the same forces that originated the idea of conscription in time of peace solidly aligned in behalf of conscription in time of war. They have recruited their ranks from the frightened and thoughtless, but the commanders of the undemocratic array consist of the old guard of munitions makers, war contractors, captains of industry, Wall Street speculators, metropolitan financiers, reactionary and corrupt newspapers and all their crowd of underlings and liberty-hating parasites, snobs, and flatterers. This motley array, beating their tom-toms of fear, now are seeking to drive the Nation into the conscription trap. As was said publicly by the most prominent conscriptionist among them just before war was declared, "Now is our chance to get permanent compulsory military service. Let's make our big drive for it now while the people are excited over the war."

REASONS FOR CONSCRIPTION NOW.

In his recent letter to Representative HELVERING, of Kansas, President Wilson gave as the sole reason why conscription should be adopted at this time that those should be chosen as soldiers who could be most readily spared from other pursuits.

To say the least of it this is an inconclusive reason. The same rules may as well be applied in accepting volunteers as in selective conscription. The idea is that men occupied in necessary callings such as food and munitions production should be continued at their work, and that men who are engaged in producing luxuries and other unnecessary pursuits should be first taken for the Army. Clearly there is not the slightest reason why when a volunteer offers to enlist his occupation may not be ascertained, and if it should be one of the necessary occupations that he should be rejected. This was the course taken by the British in their enlistments and worked well; it is the method followed in Canada to-day. Surely we are not to abandon our traditional American voluntary system on such a flimsy pretext.

In shocking inconsistency with the President's argument, over 3,000 men daily are even now being recruited for the Army and Navy. More than 50,000 have been recruited since April 1. These recruits are taken indiscriminately from industry. No questions are asked as to their usefulness in their callings. They are being recruited in flat violation of the policy announced by the President.

The argument is inconsistent in itself since the plan is to conscript the least useful men between the ages of 19 and 25, so that all of the useless—call them slackers and cowards if you choose—between 25 and 45 go scot-free. Any sensible system of selective conscription would take the least useful of all ages fit for military service. What argument can there be for omitting loafers, slackers, and useless men between 25 and 45 and victimizing only the young. Is this to be a boys' war?

Another claim for conscription heard in some quarters, but not mentioned by the President, is that the voluntary system takes the best, bravest, and most patriotic and requires them to fight the battles of the country while the cowards, slackers, and useless are permitted to remain at home. This is a claim that is likely to be given some weight by the uninformed. In truth, however, it is not sustained by the facts and experience which show that very largely the same classes volunteer in time of war that enlist in the Regular Army in time of peace. There are, it is true, a small percentage of highly patriotic men who enlist in time of war, but usually these do not compose one-fourth of the total. The remainder who volunteer are adventurous spirits, men out of employment, the thoughtless, the ne'er-do-wells, the discontented, and other similar classes.

In a typical company of volunteers called during the Spanish War it was found that 18 were men who had left responsible positions and enlisted from a sense of patriotic duty; 22 were immature boys who had been overpersuaded by the recruiting officer, and who were in school or had no regular occupations; 23 for social reasons had previously served in the National Guard and felt obligated to volunteer; 24 were workmen out of jobs; 14 were idlers, transients, or nondescripts and could not be classified; 3 were freshly landed immigrants who had not become settled in the country. All of them were, no doubt, influenced to a large extent by curiosity, the spirit of adventure, and the persuasion of recruiters.

I would not, of course, leave the impression that in a war of the magnitude of the present volunteer regiments would be composed of identical material with those in the Spanish War. Also manifestly it must be impossible to learn with certainty a soldier's motive for enlisting. Again, perhaps, every volunteer has mixed motives. It is a fact, however, which will not be denied by anyone having a thorough first-hand knowledge of the subject that a majority of those who volunteer do not do so from high motives of pure patriotism, and that

usually other factors than an unmixed sense of duty control. Those who have studied the subject will agree that men of the highest character and the keenest sense of duty may not as a rule be the first to volunteer. Such men have conflicting obligations which they weigh carefully. On the other hand the imprudent, the adventurous, the thoughtless, the shiftless, the homeless, these comprise a majority of those who are first attracted to the recruiting office. *The voluntary system in chief drains away the surplus men, not the ones who are most useful.* Men who are highly skilled in their trades or who have permanent positions and draw good wages are the ones who sacrifice most and hence are slow to enlist.

TROOPS RAISED MORE QUICKLY BY VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.

One of the false arguments put forth by the conscriptionists is that we have need for great armies immediately, and that troops may be raised more quickly by conscription. The fact is, as experts from the War Department admit, our armies may be recruited more rapidly by the voluntary system. To put conscription in force the entire country must be organized, agencies established, and all men subject to service enumerated and registered. This is a much larger task than taking a mere population census and would require several months' time and cost a great deal of money. The lowest official estimate of time within which men of desired ages may be registered is three months. When this is finished the process of selection and examination may proceed. Regiments must be constituted and organized outright. Conservative expert opinion is that if conscription is used it will be not less than five months before any substantial number of soldiers can be put in training.

On the other hand, if volunteers are called for they will be raised in companies and regiments and turned over to the Government as complete units. Sixty days will be sufficient to bring them into the field. Many men who have served in the Regular Army or in the National Guard and are already trained will enlist. The training will be well underway in 60 days.

It is a fact, however, that there is no occasion for haste in getting the men assembled. Under the national-defense act of 1916 the Government is already authorized by law to raise 641,000 volunteers and to increase the Regular Army to 287,000, total troops now authorized being 928,000. No effort is being made to fill up the National Guard organizations. The fact is that the War Department has not got supplies for the men already authorized, neither uniforms, guns, nor other equipment. Notwithstanding the appropriation for the Army of \$287,000,000 made a year ago, there are no arms and equipment on hand sufficient for even 500,000 men. It will take until July 1 next to accumulate equipment for 500,000 men, and even at that time there will be no heavy cannon for these men. Although the money for the purpose was appropriated last year and is still in hand, no heavy cannon will be available for seven months yet.

In a recent statement Mr. Secretary Baker said:

We will have enough supplies and equipment of all kinds, except, of course, heavy ordnance and things of that sort, which require a long time in the making, for 500,000 men by the 1st of July, and we will have adequate supplies of all kinds, except, of course, these long time-consuming constructions of heavy ordnance and things of that kind, for 1,000,000 men inside of eight months.

The Army has at this time only 690,000, all told, of the regulation rifle now in use. This includes all rifles in the hands of the Regular Army and National Guard. These rifles can not be obtained by contract, and the supply has increased only about 13,000 during the past year. Our new armies will have to be equipped with the English Enfield rifle, not so good a gun as the one now in use; and even these rifles are yet to be manufactured, and months will be consumed in producing a sufficient number.

I do not mention these facts to call attention to the shocking inefficiency of the bureaus charged with accumulating supplies for the Army. It has been no fault of Congress, for Congress has made the necessary appropriations. Congress has done all that it was asked to do. I refer to the situation to show those who press for the immediate enlistment of large numbers of men that we have no use for the men at this time. We have for them neither arms, equipment, nor supplies. They could do nothing, not even be trained, if they were now brought into the field. The question of speed in recruiting is therefore not important. *Even were haste required, armies could be raised more speedily by the voluntary system than by conscription.*

"AVOID BRITISH BLUNDERS."

We hear the cry from the conscriptionists that we should "avoid British blunders." By this glittering generality the impression is sought to be made that Britain's failure of complete success in the war has been due to the failure to adopt conscription at the beginning. This is a grossly false impres-

sion. The British have blundered in handling troops in the field and in other military and political measures. They blundered in failing to furnish their troops with an adequate supply of heavy guns and ammunition, but it can not be honestly said that there has been a blunder in their method of raising men by the voluntary system. Britain entered the war with only 175,000 regular soldiers. To January, 1916, in the British Isles alone over 5,000,000 men had been raised as volunteers. A conscription law was then passed, and something like 1,000,000 additional have since been brought under arms. To-day five out of every six men in the British Army are volunteers.

Canada has raised 400,000 men, and yet has not adopted nor have her people even considered adopting conscription.

What a commentary! The great United States, with its 100,000,000 population, with no immediate need for men and no ability to equip them, with no chance to send them to the battle field, proposes to start the war with conscription when little Canada, with less than one-tenth of our population—our immediate neighbor on the north and much the same kind of people that we are—has not even proposed conscription to this time.

Australia has also raised about 400,000 volunteers. In October, 1916, a proposition for conscription was submitted to the people of Australia and was voted down by a decisive majority.

What a commentary! Are we less democratic than the British Islands? Are we less democratic than Canada and Australia? Are we more willing to surrender our liberties and submit to an odious system of forced military service than they?

The British at all times have had plenty of men. The men were brought to the colors faster than they could be equipped. For 12 months after certain regiments had been raised they marched to and fro on Salisbury Plain, without ever having had guns in their hands. Soldiers without arms! Britain has always had the men, but she went into the war unprepared in the sense that she did not have the supplies, equipment, and the munitions. Her factories had not been organized so as to produce these articles for war. It is only now when Britain's industrial activities are coordinated for the production of war supplies that she is able to put forth her full strength. A conscript in camp is worth nothing without equipment. You can not train him. He is useless, a mere idler.

The British blunder was not in failing to take adequate measures to raise the human material for war, but in failing to foresee the immense consumption of munitions and supplies on the battle field. We have already committed the British blunder in that our officers charged with the duty of spending the money that Congress appropriated have not accumulated sufficient arms and supplies for armies that we wish to raise, and these essentials will not be available for several months yet.

As a matter of fact, conscription was never necessary in Britain. As finally adopted it does not apply to Ireland. It was adopted as a political measure rather than a military necessity. Britain has her conscriptionists, her privileged and selfish classes who have been clamoring for conscription for years. It is from them that our conscriptionists have borrowed their methods. The British conscriptionists comprise a powerful political faction; through their newspapers they hammered the Government constantly. They criticized and bullied and finally the British Government gave in. Conscription in Britain was adopted to disarm the political opposition of the conscriptionists, not because it was necessary to carry on the war.

REASONS OF THE MILITARY SATRAPY.

The powers which are seeking to fix a system of conscription upon us have one set of reasons that they give to the public, another set which they privately entertain. One reason which influences military circles is the desire to increase the numbers of the Army so as to multiply opportunities for promotion and to give an excuse for larger pay and higher rank and honors. Their objection to the National Guard and to any system of volunteering is based on their opposition to men from civil life coming into the Army as officers. The average Regular Army officer cherishes an intense caste spirit. He hates Volunteer officers, for they are his rivals. They receive rank and position which he regards as his exclusive prerogative. According to the standard of the Regular Army officer, the Volunteer officer is too democratic, too much at home with his men—treats the enlisted men with entirely too much consideration and good fellowship. He is a source of irritation in a system of rigid caste and tends to disrupt the iron discipline which would create an impassible social gulf between officer and men.

The average Army officer lives in a rigid groove of caste prejudice and professional practices. The Volunteer officer tends to disrupt this system. He brings in new ideas. He has

a free and easy way of overturning precedent and ripping red tape, cardinal sins in Army circles.

The iron determination of the Regular Army officers in favor of conscription at this time as opposed to the National Guard and all other voluntary systems is based on the desire to keep the National Guard officers out of the Army, especially officers of high rank. Necessarily many thousands of new officers must be admitted, but these in the main will be unformed boys of the upper classes, who may be easily shaped into the Army caste, and all new officers will be given only the most subordinate places. The vast increase in our troops furnishes a golden opportunity for officers of the Regular Army, opportunity for rapid promotion and wide influence. With 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 men in the field every Regular Army officer of the age of 30 or thereabouts will become in due course, and without effort or merit on his part, of rank as high as colonel. Already they propose to abolish the rank of brigadier general, so that from colonel hundreds will jump to the rank of major general, with its pay of \$9,300 per year. Others still will be lieutenant generals, and perhaps will go forward until we vie with the military systems of Europe with field marshals of incredibly large pay, honors, and authority.

These are the prizes for which the Regular Army men are fighting. Personal prizes, not prizes of patriotism. Small wonder, then, that the Government's military advisers are unanimous for conscription.

Perhaps there may be hope for a slightly increased efficiency under the organization which the Regular Army proposes. There will be few politicians given opportunities to make names as Army officers, and for this let us be thankful. Men are to be enlisted in regiments without regard to the localities from which they come. They are to be fed into regiments wherever required. It will be less trouble to pick up a conscript and send him into a remote regiment to fill a vacancy than to regiment men from various States and localities together. This, so the Regular Army says, is in the interest of efficiency. There will be no Alabama troops, no Ohio troops, merely troops of the United States—conscripts all.

I believe that men will make better soldiers fighting alongside their friends. Boys will be desperately homesick, driven into strange regiments without friends, acquaintances, or anyone from home, and I do not believe the system proposed by the Regular Army will in this respect make for the highest efficiency. I do not believe that the fighting qualities of an army so organized will equal that of American troops organized under the old system, where friend stood along with friend and brother by brother's side.

MOTIVES OF CONSCRIPTIONISTS.

The civilian conscriptionist has even less creditable motives than his associate in military life. For the past two years an energetic and expensive propaganda has been carried on in this country in favor of compulsory military service. This propaganda has been through books and publications issued in its behalf and the parasite newspaper organs of the selfish interests which were advocating it, by paid lecturers sent over the country, by motion pictures, and in other ways. This propaganda had its origin and has been financially supported by small groups located in financial and industrial centers and whose identity is well known.

When it appeared that war with Germany would be declared these selfish groups redoubled their activities. As stated by one of their leaders, *the war seemed to be the best chance they would ever have of putting their scheme through, so they sought to strike while the iron was hot.* A special effort was made, their vicious newspapers redoubled their efforts, prominent lecturers were sent into various centers upon various pretexts to rouse the people, to frighten them, and to prepare the way for what was to follow.

On the day before war was declared there came to me through the mail a number of pamphlets, letters, and so forth, urging a declaration of war upon Germany. This propaganda came from certain conscriptionist sources and had a common purpose. I read it with interest. One leaflet was from the Yale Club, of New York, and recited pompously that "We men of Yale" demand war with Germany, and followed that by a demand for the immediate inauguration of a system of compulsory military service. Another leaflet was from the Tavern Club, of Boston; another from the Harvard Club; another from the American Rights League, signed by Joseph H. Choate, George De Haven Putnam, Elihu Root, and others. Another pamphlet was from the Union League Club, of New York, and there were others from similar exclusive organizations. This propaganda came from the most reactionary sources in the United States, the most undemocratic sources, the least enlightened sources, from those who had constantly championed conscription in time of

peace as a means to discipline youth, teach respect for law, order, and property, make society more stable, and to create a reservoir of reserves to be drawn upon in case of war. Not one of the arguments which had previously been used by these conscriptionists is now assigned by anyone connected with the Government in behalf of the proposed conscription legislation.

All of these pieces of propaganda were in substance the same. They first demanded war with Germany and, second, demanded conscription. In no instance were the reasons which are now given assigned for the latter demand.

I have before me the publication from the Union League Club, of New York. It contains the report of a special committee which, among others, included Robert Bacon, George F. Baker, Cornelius N. Bliss, jr., Joseph H. Choate, Henry P. Davison, Chauncey M. Depew, Samuel W. Fairchild, Clarence H. Mackay, Frank A. Munsey, Ogden Mills Reid, Elihu Root, Herbert L. Satterlee, Theodore N. Vail, and Cornelius Vanderbilt.

Anyone acquainted with American finance and big business will at once recognize these names. They are identified with all that is monopolistic, oppressive, and unjust in American business life. They and their associates are the men who practically run this country. They have monopolized our natural resources; they are exploiting the people, not only of America, but of a large part of the world; they control public opinion through their parasite newspapers. Indeed, they bestride the new world like colossi, and common men exist largely through their sufferance. These are they who are the champions of conscription. They are the natural enemies of democracy. There can be no democracy when these men rule. There will be none where their schemes are put through.

The interests behind conscription are largely big business and big finance. Its champions are dreamers, but they dream vicious dreams of world conquest and exploitation. Their dreams are of the American flag sent into the remote corners of the world to protect their operations and to guard the extension of the systems whereby they have brought America under their feet.

The champions of conscription, they who originated and have financed the scheme, need big armies and navies to protect their investments in foreign lands, to secure for them the safe return of dividends from concessions of mines, railroads, and so forth, and the exploitation of weak and undeveloped peoples. They cherish political schemes, for theirs is the "New Imperialism" which would place America alongside the plutocratic European nations in their conquest of the world. Under their baneful influence Dewey was sent into Manila Bay so that we might seize the Philippines as a base for expansion in China and the Orient. For them we raped Colombia of Panama, so that we might extend our operations throughout South America. For them we have sent our soldiers into Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Costa Rica and stand like a bloated bully with a drawn club over the petty States of Central America. What may be their further dreams I do not know, but I fear that they are fraught with the most evil consequences to American ideals.

The interests engaged in promoting conscription want big armies for home use. They say, "We have too much discontent, too many Socialists, too many I. W. W.'s, too many strikes, too much industrial disorder, too much freedom of speech, too many ranting demagogues and labor agitators." They would suppress all this with the iron hand of the military. They would take the youth of the land while it is yet impressionable, force it into their armies, rob it of its principles of democracy, teach it docility and respect for them and their property, so that the New World might be made over to resemble the Old, with its castes of prestige and privilege.

The financial and big business interests that are championing conscription as a permanent system see in this national crisis their golden opportunity. They have seized on the war crisis as the time to put through their scheme. It is not for the war that they wish conscription but for its effect when peace has come. With them it is now or never. They expect to commit the Nation to conscription at this time so that forced military service will be fixed on us as a permanent thing and we will never be able to shake it off again. This is the stake that they are playing for.

These forces seem to have wanted the war for the opportunity that it gives to fix their system on us. They did not want conscription for the war, but wanted the war hoping that they might get conscription out of it. They have roused themselves to their supremest activity. Every influence of which they can avail themselves is being brought to bear. They have sent out the word and their minions are lashed into a fury. Their newspapers belch out their noxious gases in the nostrils of the people, and all who may be deceived, frightened, or

intimidated, all of the thoughtless, timid, or corrupt elements in the land are marshaled under their flag.

I fight these influences in defense of our national dignity and honor. I fight them as I would the foe across the sea to preserve American ideals and institutions. I will not surrender to them. I would rather die than to lose so cheaply the liberties for which our ancestors shed their blood.

CONSCRIPTION IS UNNECESSARY.

Conscription is unnecessary in two senses. In the first place, we can get all the troops we need by the voluntary system. It seems unlikely that 1,000,000 volunteers will enlist to go across the seas to shed their blood in foreign lands. If it is our purpose to send vast armies to take part in European battles, then forced service may be necessary. But if we intend to send only 500,000 men to France, enough hot-blooded Americans can be found to enlist for that adventure. Recruited to full strength, our Regular Army will comprise 287,000 and will alone furnish men for a European campaign.

Our people when they volunteer want to know what they are fighting for. If they are fighting for our national defense and honor, millions of volunteers will come forward. If the campaign is to settle quarrels between European dynasties, perhaps only the hardy and adventurous, those who will fight for the sheer love of it, will enlist.

Why not enlist two forces with a definite understanding as to what they are to do? Enlist one force for foreign service. If 500,000 will suffice, enough volunteers may be had. Enlist another force for the defense of our country with the understanding that they are not to be sent into foreign lands. No matter how many men may be desired for this force, they will readily come forward. Our people are not lacking in real patriotism. They will volunteer just as well as the British have done. Millions of Americans will rush to the flag if they are to be used only to defend our own shores.

To insist on conscription at the beginning of this war is an imputation against the courage and patriotism of our people. It is equal to a charge that they are selfish and unworthy. It is a confession upon the part of the conscriptionists that the war is not a popular war, that the heart of the people is not in the war. There may be some basis for the thought that America does not give herself wholeheartedly to this war. However that may be, our people are patriotic and there will be no lack of men to defend our country. Men will enlist whether they approve the war or the means by which it came on or not.

Conscription is unnecessary in another sense. Our Regular Army recruited to full strength is 287,000. The National Guard when recruited to war strength is 641,000, making a total of 928,000 already authorized under existing laws. No call for volunteers has been made. The President has issued no proclamation asking the people to enlist, yet they are enlisting at the rate of over 3,000 each day. This enlistment is going on although there is no equipment for the men and the States have been refused permission to muster in new regiments of National Guard or to bring the National Guard up to full war strength.

Let the President issue his proclamation asking for volunteers and authorizing the States to bring up the National Guard to full war strength. Within 60 days the entire quota of 928,000 men will be raised. We have not got guns and equipment for even these men. Surely our armies will be large enough for the present when such a vast number is brought to the colors. When these armies have been raised and equipped it will then be time to consider whether we should go further in our war preparations.

CONSCRIPTION IS UNAMERICAN.

The Revolutionary War was fought by volunteers as were our colonial wars. From the beginning of American history volunteers have been relied on in this country. Volunteer service is shined in American tradition. It is the traditional American method of raising armies.

During the Civil War it was thought expedient in 1863 to pass a sort of conscription act to stimulate enlisting men in the Union armies. Out of 2,700,000 Union soldiers in the Civil War only about 60,000 were conscripts. The enforcement of the draft act caused riots, generally disorganized the country, and was of no real military value.

The Southern Confederacy raised a few soldiers by conscription. Most of the conscripts laid down or ran away the first battle. Many of them were Unionists and deserted to the Union Army. The attempt to conscript soldiers into the Confederate Army drove thousands of southerners who were loyal to the Union into the Federal Army. Over 30,000 Federal soldiers enlisted from Tennessee alone. Five entire Union regiments were enlisted among Confederate prisoners at Rock Island.

Desertions largely operated to break the back of the Confederacy. Many of the deserters were conscripts.

The average American likes to regard himself as a free moral agent. As a volunteer he fights heroically, cherishing the ideal that he is serving his country without compulsion. It will break the morale of our men to force them into service. Conscription is violative of American traditions. Our people may be led; they can not be driven. They are not of exactly the same stuff as the docile European conscript. It will serve to impair their fighting qualities when they look upon themselves as dumb animals driven to the trenches rather than as free Americans fighting voluntarily for their country.

It was well said in time of the Civil War that it took two good soldiers to keep one conscript in line. Under a system of conscription many will be forced to the ranks who have conscientious objections and who are dissatisfied for other reasons. A general spirit of discontent will be engendered; regiments will be honeycombed with unrest and dissatisfaction. The martial spirit of our people will be dulled. There will be many aliens in our ranks fighting against those of their own blood. I would rather have one-half the number in enthusiastic whole-hearted soldiers than to infect the whole with the discontent and unrest of the unwilling minority.

If we are to expect our armies to acquit themselves in accordance with our glorious military traditions, they must fight on the same plane with the Americans of previous wars. They must have the same respect for themselves, the same ideals of freemen. They must cherish the same glorious memories. You can not get that kind of fighting out of servile conscripts.

I am able to understand the pride which a soldier may take in the name of "volunteer." I remember well the bright Sunday morning of the 1st of May, 1898, when I shouldered my rifle as a private soldier at the outbreak of the Spanish War. I remember the pride that I took in myself and in my comrades as volunteer soldiers. I was sustained throughout the trials of service by the thought that I was serving of my own accord. Always I have looked back upon my service as a soldier with a feeling of pride and added self-respect because I was a volunteer. *I am unwilling to rob the men who must fight this war of the proud name of volunteer. I am unwilling to brand them as conscripts, as those who must be forced to serve their country.*

CONSCRIPTION BREEDS FAVORITISM AND CORRUPTION.

All claims in behalf of the justice of conscription are based on the assumption that it will be fairly enforced, that the burden will rest upon all classes equally, and that it will be enforced impartially against all. Upon no other theory is the idea of conscription tolerable for an instant, but experience has shown that it opens wide the door for the gravest administrative abuses.

To bring men into the ranks under a system of conscription requires their registration, their division into classes, and so forth. Medical examinations are required, and there are many loopholes through which favored ones may escape on the way. The administration of the law will necessarily be left to a governmental bureau and its details in charge of officials, many of whom will be hastily selected petty officers. It is inevitable that there will be many instances of favoritism, perhaps even of corruption. Men will be omitted from registration, because there is no way to check the matter up. Men will be excused for falsely certified small defects, defective eyesight, hearing, or teeth, or flat feet, or rheumatism, or some minor disease. This is inevitable. It will impair the confidence of the people in the system and cause intense dissatisfaction.

It is already being planned that all the commissioned officers are to be taken from the better educated and upper social classes. Few indeed are the working men or their sons who will be allowed to wear swords. The masses will do the digging and the sweating. They will be shown the least favoritism and allowed the fewest exemptions.

The system whereby officers for the new armies will be chosen has already been exposed. They are to be taken from the idle rich men who have attended the Plattsburg camps, from college boys, and others of the upper classes. The lowest commissioned officers are to be appointed only after rigid educational tests. It will take at least a high-school graduate to stand the examinations. It is not proposed to appoint practical, every-day sort of men, used to dealing with men and affairs as officers. Rather it is intended to make commissions the prize of a sort of Chinese pedantry which will exclude all but the best educated. The truth is that there is more concern to select men who are "socially right" than those who are capable of dealing with the practical concerns of army life.

An enlisted man of the Regular Army or National Guard will have no chance for a commission based upon his record of hon-

orable service and his capacity for performance of military duty. He must stand the test of examination in the sciences and mathematics to be admitted. Gen. Forrest, perhaps the most capable Cavalry commander that the world ever saw, would be unable to get a commission as second lieutenant in the American Army.

I am receiving hundreds of letters from men of the upper class seeking commissions in the Army; not one of these has expressed a willingness to enlist as a private. No workingman has asked for a commission. They know that there is no chance for them no matter how capable, generally speaking, they may be.

It is one thing to pass conscription laws; another to enforce them. Always it is easier to enforce the laws against the poor and humble. If any may escape their meshes, it is the classes having wealth and influence. Let no hard-handed workingman expect to find the son of the capitalist serving alongside his son on terms of equality. A way will be found to avoid that. As a last resort there are unmerited promotions and soft places to be found, perfunctory duties to be performed, easy clerkships, and such like. The toil and the drudgery, the digging and the sweating, will be reserved for the sons of the masses.

CONSCRIPTION IS DISCRIMINATORY.

Conscription is based on discrimination. It starts out with its exemptions and its methods of selection. It is not intended to rest equally upon all citizens. It culls out a few for military duty. These victims are subjected to rigid discipline and all the hardships of the campaign with the risk of their lives. The balance go free and continue to enjoy all their pleasures and privileges. Conscripts are not even chosen by lot out of the entire mass. Those above prescribed ages and following exempted callings are never under the hazard that they may be taken. Yet all these might render useful service for the State, even many of them do so now as officials and will continue to draw the salaries and enjoy all the privileges of peace.

Conscription can not be fair and democratic, unless all are taken, from the oldest down to even the youngest who is useful. If one citizen should be forced to serve the State all should be equally subject. The fact that a man can not render active service as a soldier is nothing. The civilian side of war's activity is much wider than the military side. The production of the necessities of life for the people as well as supplies and equipment for the Army calls for vast numbers in civilian employments. If citizens may be taken for service in the trenches, why may they not also be taken for service in the fields and workshops? Why should unproductive bankers, agents, and professional men go scot-free merely because they are over a certain age or physically unsuited for trench duty? Why should not these parasite classes and social burdens be seized upon and put to doing something that is useful, something beneficial to the whole? Why should we not send them into the fields to harden their muscles and to improve their physical condition with fresh air and outdoor work?

Just conscription levies not on a few but upon all. It does not discriminate between the worker in a munition factory and a clerk behind the counter. It does not say to Jack, "You shall go to war because you are of this age," and to John, "You are free because you are a year older." It does not say to William, a clerk, "You are to go into the trenches; you are to sweat or shiver or starve and to lose your life or to come home maimed all for \$15 per month," and to Henry, the munitions worker, "You are to continue on at your employment enjoying all the pleasures and privileges of peace at \$5 per day."

Conscription is State slavery. It is involuntary servitude, not for crime. It is so harsh and violative of every principle of liberty that it should not be used except in time of actual necessity. It is a measure for an extremity not for ordinary times. To make it necessary the peril of the Nation should be so great as to require a supreme sacrifice from every citizen. If conscription is justified at all, then it is only when universal conscription is necessary. There should be no exemptions nor exceptions. Not that all may be needed as soldiers but that all may be needed for service for the Nation, for service for the public welfare. All should be put upon an equality without discrimination between married or single, rich or poor, educated or ignorant. Family and business ties should be ignored and every citizen regarded as merely a member of the community to serve the whole and to be cared for by the whole.

Property is not so sacred in its nature as life and liberty. The right of the individual to control his own actions is more important than his right to own property. Conscription is confiscation of men. It restrains their liberties, forces their actions, and drives them into danger, perhaps at the cost of their lives. *If conscription of men be permissible conscription of property is also justified. If men's liberties and lives may be taken for the public welfare, then property may also be con-*

fiscated. Surely it will not be argued that property stands upon higher ground than man.

A system of conscription of men which leaves property free is inherently unjust. It is undemocratic. That a man who has nothing but his life to lose shall be forced to hazard it in service for the State and that a capitalist shall preserve his property intact is shocking to an enlightened conscience.

If it be said that the conscript man is used temporarily—borrowed, as it were, for the emergency—and that the hazard of his life is a mere incident, I answer by asking why, then, should property not be borrowed, used temporarily, and returned at the end of the war? How can it be just when human material for war is taken without compensation that war supplies and finances for war may not also be taken? What justice is there when men are being conscripted that property owners should be receiving incomes from their possessions?

CONSCRIPTION IS UNDEMOCRATIC.

Why is conscription undemocratic?

First. Even when laid equally upon all ages and classes it imposes the burden of public defense equally per capita upon the population, whereas the burdens of government should be borne in proportion to the benefits received. Since property enjoys the chief benefit of government and its protection occasions the chief governmental expense it should bear the chief part of the burden of public defense. Men should be required to respond to public duty in the same measure that they receive a benefit from the public. Conscription rests the burden of public defense upon the individual without regard to property interests or benefits derived from the Government.

Second. Conscription for military duty can not be equally borne by the whole people, for many are physically unfit, others are cowards and can not fight, many are too old, many are too young, many are women; all these escape, yet all share in the benefits of government.

Third. The burden of conscription is not laid equally on all, even of those taken for service. Some 3 per cent are commissioned officers enjoying position, honors, pay, and opportunities immeasurably above the remainder; 15 to 20 per cent are petty officers enjoying superior emoluments and comforts to a marked degree. The remainder are private soldiers who do all the work and most of the suffering and get nothing in return except the scantiest necessities of life.

Fourth. Conscription is undemocratic because it develops bureaucracy, takes the control of affairs from the representatives of the people, places it in the hands of officials who are out of contact with them. Hence the administration of the system of conscription is subject to the discretion of irresponsible officials and the peculiar subject of the grossest abuses, oppression, corruption, and favoritism.

Fifth. It is undemocratic because it forces men into an autocratic system in which respect is given to authority, not to merit, in which the rewards go to place and not to capacity, in which servile obedience is the highest virtue and independence and individuality the most serious vice. Out of this system men may come humble, docile, and unimaginative but never virile, aggressive, and reasoning citizens. Its tendency is toward autocracy and not toward popular government.

THE CRUELEST INJUSTICE.

Selective conscription, so called, is the worst form of all. It consciously and intentionally lays its burden upon a select few. It is its purpose not to reach all alike, but to victimize certain classes and callings. Its administration is left to a bureau which is out of touch with the people; that it will be the means of the grossest oppression and tyranny can not for a moment be questioned.

The cruelest feature of selective conscription, its most vicious feature, is the plan to victimize the boys of the land. It proposes to seize on those under 21. It is not content to discriminate among those of mature age, but aims its vile purpose at helpless and inoffensive boys.

What a cruel injustice to deprive a boy of his chance, to rob him of the opportunity of his youth, to finish his education, to learn a trade, to get a fair and early start in life!

The conscription of men under 21 is grossly unjust. It is undemocratic and oppressive, because it levies upon nonvoters, those who have had no voice in bringing on the war, who were not consulted, who are helpless, who are not represented in Congress or official place, boys who have no votes with which to avenge themselves upon those who would force this system upon them, who are driven like dumb helpless sheep to slaughter. The shame of it to limit the age of those who are to be conscripted at below 25! Not a Member of Congress but is above that age, not a Government official but is above that age, not an agitator for conscription from one end of the land to the other but is above that age. We would vote that on others

which neither we nor any of our age or class will have to endure. This in the name of democracy!

Conscription of boys is wrong. It is foolish to take boys out of the home circle before their characters are formed, innocent boys, and unaccustomed to temptation, unschooled in the ways of the world; to take uninformed boys and thrust them into the vicious moral atmosphere of the camp, where they will be subject to every vile temptation and moral pitfall that ever lay in wait for humanity.

Conscription of boys is economically unjust and foolish. The life of a soldier is one sometimes of hardship and privation, spasmodically laborious, but chiefly that of an idler. "Soldiering" is a word that has a well-defined meaning. Boys should have a chance to finish their education, to learn a trade, and get some little start in life, to make some plans for the future. But with a year or two taken out of their lives at the beginning of manhood, taken out of their lives and devoted to army life, they will come back stripped of ambition, schooled as idlers, with no inclination to learn a trade or to prepare themselves for life.

If we are to have conscription let us spare the boys, spare them for the sake of their health, for they are physically soft and unformed, are heedless and imprudent. They do not know how to care for themselves physically nor what to eat nor drink, and they will come back from the campaign broken and bent and diseased wrecks. They will come back rheumatic and malarious. In 1915 when our country was at peace, all our soldiers living comfortably in barracks, receiving the best of food, medical attention and care, and under the most favorable conditions for health we had an average of 93,262 enlisted men in the Army. During that year alone 69,442 were admitted to the hospital for disease or injury; there were 10,045 cases of venereal disease and 358 cases of insanity, 1,351 were discharged for physical disability, and 436 died. These were carefully chosen men of ages between 18 and 35. They were subjected to the most rigid medical examination before being admitted to service. They were not reenlisted if physically defective. Practically every case of disease originated in service. This is especially true of venereal diseases, from which one man in every nine suffered. No doubt many men were diseased when discharged, no record having been made of it, and will carry through their lives the marks of service.

Yet in the face of this terrible record conscriptionists persist that Army service will promote the health and physical well-being of young men.

MY VOTE.

I will not vote for conscription unless it shall appear necessary. I will not consider conscription necessary so long as sufficient armies to defend this country can be raised by the voluntary system. I will not vote to conscript men to send them across the sea to fight the battles of European monarchs. I will not force our boys into the raging hell of Europe in order to decide whether Italy shall have Trentino, whether Bosnia shall belong to Serbia or to Austria, whether Russia may sit at the Dardanelles, and whether Poland as a kingdom shall be under the control of Germany or Russia.

I clearly foresee the fury that my political enemies will raise against me at home. Already in my ears there rises the roar of the torrent of abuse and misrepresentation. I am duly mindful that I am refusing to obey the dominant voices of my city, the newspaper voices, the voices of wealth, prestige, and influence. But I am undismayed by the prospect. I hear rather the still small voice of conscience than the thunder of opposition. I hear rather the pleading mothers and the plaintive voices of common men, of those who toil while others sleep.

I have been a private soldier, and if it should be necessary will enlist again. I am willing to fight with arms in my hands in defense of our institutions. Surely, I should be willing to speak and vote to defend them. I would be willing to shed my blood defending my country against a foreign invader. I am no less willing to defend American liberties with my life if need be when they are assailed by internal foes.

I have no word of criticism for those who hold to opinions which differ from mine. This is America, the land of the free. Freedom of opinion is one of the things that makes this country worth fighting for. I respect any man's conscientious and deliberate opinions. I crave for my own the same consideration and regard. I do my duty as I see it. Let others be guided by the same light of conscience.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I must make the frank confession that up until the last few days I had reached the conclusion to vote against any bill embodying the essential features of a selective draft unless predicated upon the prior use and

patent failure of a pure volunteer system. In fact, I had so stated my purpose to some of my colleagues here. I was impelled to that conviction by the very arguments used by those now supporting the majority report.

By now stating, that after more mature reflection, and after hearing the arguments urged I have reached a different conclusion and shall vote for a selective draft, or universal obligation to service, it is probable that I shall share the censure of those who are being criticized as mere rubber stamps and marionettes, to register only the will of the Executive. But I am comforted by the reflection that of all the personal autocracies known to man the most despicable and indefensible is that of intolerance of an honest conviction candidly expressed.

To take the side of voting against the selective draft would be imminently "the easiest way." It would require less explanation; it would invite no personal political disaster; but, Mr. Chairman, in an hour like this, under conditions unprecedented in our national history, in deliberating upon great questions of national policy involving even our national life, it seems to me that it is a time to subordinate every element of the personal equation and to forget the geographical confines of a congressional district, to merge these considerations into the larger necessities of a national emergency. [Applause.] Whatever of disaster or blundering our arms may suffer, the people of the tenth district of Alabama will measurably suffer with every other district in shame, in regret, in humiliations.

What is the thing we are here contriving to do? To raise a new army for national security and defense. How shall such an army be raised? From among the male citizens of the United States. And why should the Government expect them to serve as soldiers under its flag? Because of an implied and specific moral and civic obligation. If our flag has been insulted, our citizens murdered on the high seas in contravention of all law human, international, and divine; if our outraged national dignity and self-respect stands flouted before the world, are these accumulated grievances directed against us as a Nation, or only against that proportion of our people who would be gallant enough to volunteer to resent them? [Applause.] It is our national sovereignty that is defied, and not a capricious portion of our people. This Nation in its political autonomy is one fabric, indivisible and homogeneous. Whatever alien hand strikes at a single star in the flag strikes at them all, and all the peoples of the States they represent. [Applause.] Whoever would lay an impious stripe of shame upon those of honor and glory profanes at his peril a whole people. [Applause.]

So our burden and our duty in this crisis is joint, not several; it is universal, not fantastic. Who shall fill the ranks? Only those choice spirits whose first impulse of duty and honor calls them to the colors, while the slumberers and the callous share not their peril but only the fruits of their sacrifices?

It is one of the mudsills of our structure of freedom that all men are guaranteed equality of opportunity under the law, equality of protection in life, property, and the pursuit of happiness. Is it not fair, is it not just, is it not honest, that the Government should not only expect but require equality of burden under the law? What man among the slothful would be laggard in claiming the benefit of habeas corpus if improperly imprisoned or trial by jury if under indictment for felony? It is his to claim. His Government has given him that constitutional right. If his property is unlawfully seized, he invokes the writ of detinue. If his character is assailed, he can sue for defamation. But, sir, if his Government is assailed, which gives him all this protection; if the sacred traditions and inviolable rights of its citizens on the high seas are "plundered, profaned, prostituted, and disinherited," he says I will let my neighbor volunteer to look after that business; I am not personally involved. Gentlemen, is that democracy; is that even decent human conduct?

Universal obligations of service and burden are inextricably interwoven in all our political and civic relations to the State. Where is there a public treasury that would receive just consideration if the payment of taxes was voluntary? What court of justice could rely upon a single venire to try some desperate and disagreeable murder case if the jury boxes of the country only contained the names of those citizens who volunteered to perform that duty? The public highways of America in every township would soon resolve themselves into ruts and quagmires were it not for the law of compulsory road duty within certain arbitrary limitations. Every peaceful community in the country would be subject to the merciless brutality of a desperado save for the watch and ward of a posse comitatus of civilians drafted for emergency.

I can find no good reason or sound logic to urge that in the gravest of national, which really in its last analysis means per-

sonal, peril to our citizens, their wives and children and hearthstones, there should be an entirely different standard of duty for all men within the same arbitrary reasonable limitations.

It is argued that the main advantage of the majority bill is that it will give soldiers quicker than by waiting for the registration proposed by the minority plan. God knows that I am in no hurry to get them to the trenches. I still maintain that there does not now exist any justification to send an American army to Europe. I voted for the Britten amendment to the war resolution not to send our boys to the shambles except by consent of Congress, but if they are to go let us see to it by this legislation that they go thoroughly trained, equipped, experienced, and prepared for trench warfare in its abominable worst, and that they go each on equal terms of honor and self-respect and each with the consoling consciousness that if he dies on the field of honor or if he survives it was because his country called him on terms of equal dignity and justice with every comrade who shares his fate. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, these considerations I have suggested have been intended to touch upon the reason and justice and fairness of this proposal. There are other considerations of a practical nature that seem to me involved in this controversy.

I am a new Member of this body. I am not accustomed to the intricacies of government and government regulations, the same as you enjoy, but in my observation of human organizations I have always found it necessary to lodge and to fix the final arbitrary power with some head of some governing body.

We have as President of the United States a man chosen by popular majority of the people of this country to counsel with and admonish us upon the great questions of governmental concern; and for one I fully believe in my heart that I am speaking the sentiments of a majority of my native State of Alabama [applause], although some of my colleagues differ with me, and I recognize their right to a candid difference of opinion, when I express the belief that when the final judgment of our people is made up, that the great and overwhelming majority of the people of Alabama will say that we elected that man as Chief Executive, that we believe in him and stand behind the reasonable and logical policies of our Commander in Chief, the leader of our party, the Chief Executive of the Nation, Woodrow Wilson, and I am willing to share his judgment and to follow his leadership. [Applause.]

I believe that the moral and psychological effect of an army such as would be made up under this just and equal system would have a profound effect upon Hollweg, Von Tirpitz, Hindenburg, and the Kaiser, without firing a gun, and lead to peace; but a haphazard, half-hearted, discredited, discarded system of mobilization would tend to hearten them in the belief that a sluggish and halting policy possessed America, and that there was no real punch behind our brave words.

We have a great Council of National Defense chosen from all of the citizenship because of their expert knowledge, their experience, and their judgment, and their wisdom in broad lines of human endeavor. We have invested them with power to make suggestions to the President and Congress. We are relying in this emergency upon their wisdom; and I believe we should, without question, accept their advice and suggestions.

Why, by the same token and by the same reason, can we not afford to accept the advice of these experts who constitute the General Staff of the Army, especially when those views are concurred in by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. If a volunteer is all that is needed, it appeals to me, gentlemen of the House, that these great belligerent nations in Europe who have given it a fair and impartial trial would adhere to that system instead of all of them discrediting and discarding it. Now, Mr. Chairman, a great many of us voted for this resolution declaring a state of war to exist, and I want to read a portion of it for your reminder:

Resolved, That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared, and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed—

By you—

to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

[Applause.]

Gentlemen, it seems to me that that comprehensive term embraces not only railroads, not only public utilities, not only manufacturing establishments, not only all these great enterprises the Government is mobilizing to meet this emergency, but it also involves in its largest and best analysis the mobilization upon these reasonable, fair, and just restrictions of the greatest power we possess—that is, the man power of the United

States of America. [Applause.] Gentlemen, I have no desire to trespass upon the patience of the committee. A good deal has been said in the course of this debate about sending young men under the age of 21 to the war or drafting them. I agree with the proposition suggested, but that is not involved in the controversy now before the House. I am unalterably opposed to including in the selective draft young men under the age of 21 years [applause], because, my friends, I do not believe that it is just and proper; and I want to make the statement that I shall feel very much inclined to vote against the whole proposition if that amendment does not stand like it is reported by the minority to this House. A great deal has been said about womanhood and motherhood in this debate.

Gentlemen, that phase of the case has appealed to us all, no doubt; but I do not believe—and I believe I am authorized, although not personally, to make this assertion and this statement—that the motherhood of America, those glorious women who have given these sons to the Nation, that it is not their purpose and not their anxiety and not their wish in this hour, when so much is involved, to restrain and withhold their sons from equal service upon terms of equality in this great enterprise of defending the United States of America. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will permit the completion of this very able and interesting address.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a few minutes more if it is agreeable.

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield five minutes additional.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Ah, sir, I do not believe that the motherhood of America has forgotten what transpired in Belgium and northern France. I believe that behind this crusade of justice is a matter which will move the hearts of our soldiers and fill them with real courage to resent the indefensible outrages which have been perpetrated upon the motherhood and sisterhood of Belgium and France in this great and cruel struggle. Ah, I do not believe that they have forgotten Miss Cavill and those of her sort, and that they are now in this emergency, as they have always been in the trying hours of our Republic, eager and anxious to make equal sacrifice with the fathers of the country for the preservation of the institutions of liberty, equality, and justice which prevail in this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the indulgence of the committee. It is not my purpose in these remarks to say anything that might possibly, or that could possibly, wound the feeling of any of my colleagues, especially my colleagues from the State of Alabama. I regret we can not agree upon the fundamental question involved in this bill; but after, as I suggested in the beginning, mature, thoughtful, and dispassionate consideration I could not honestly reach any other conclusion except that in this emergency the bill proposed by the minority report is the wisest, fairest, most just, and democratic method to serve the interests of our people in this great national emergency. [Applause.]

The system of selection is the only way in which every man of military age, may secure a fair and square chance to serve upon terms of equality with his neighbor. The rich and poor are on the same simple level of responsibility and mutual liability to service.

This is the only way to keep this from being "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight."

It gives the President the right to say to the man on the farm, in the mine, in the cotton mill, "You are liable to service, but the country needs you more to stay where you are to produce food and fuel and clothes than in the Army, and I choose you to serve at home."

The people of my district, I know, are willing to serve their country if they know that they will be called to serve on equal terms with all and without favoritism or partiality, and in my judgment the President's plan guarantees this result.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I have been at a loss to understand the processes of reasoning by which some of the Members of the House have during the last few days suddenly become converted to the righteousness and the wisdom of immediate conscription, but the gentleman who has just preceded me can leave us in no doubt as to the reason for the position he assumes. He says that he voted for the Britten resolution, which would have prevented the United States Government from sending a soldier to France to fight the battles of this country. He says to-day he is not so very much in favor of sending the boys to the trenches, and therefore it is natural for him to take the position that he is opposed to this selective

volunteer plan and in favor of this conscription plan, which would delay the raising of an Army for six months more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman is not doing me justice. I am not accurately quoted.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not desire to do so. What did you say?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I said I voted for the Britten amendment to the war resolution not to send an army to Europe without the consent of Congress. The gentleman did not state that in his statement.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. When did the gentleman expect Congress to send them there?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will permit, does not the Britten resolution—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, the gentleman pictures the suffering of women in Belgium and says the women of this country have not lost their patriotism, and yet he forgot all about the suffering women of Belgium and joined the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] in his effort to prevent the President from sending an army of the United States Government over to Belgium. [Applause.]

He said, my friends, that he is unalterably opposed to drafting men under 21 years of age. He says that now; but he knows and I know the Senate is going to pass that 21-year provision, and it is going to conference and it is going to come back in the bill, and the same process of reasoning that induced him to turn turtle on the conscription business will induce him to turn turtle on the age limit. He says that the volunteer system, with its sluggish mobilization, would hearten Germany. What would he do? He would follow Mr. BRITTON in a policy described by my friend from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] as directing the Army to "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water." [Laughter.] Would not it hearten Germany to say we are going to have war, but will not send an army unless Congress hereafter shall meet and determine that it should be sent. It is in keeping with every other argument of every man who has favored this conscription bill.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] yesterday was in favor of conscription because, he said, he thought it would keep "the Kelleys and Burkes and Sheas" at home. He favors conscription because he wants to keep the Irish in Boston, and the gentlemen who represent mining districts believe it will keep the miners at home. They tell the men from manufacturing districts that conscription will keep the skilled workers at home, and then they go down into the agricultural sections of the South and say, "We are going to keep your farmers at home." Then, in God's name, who is going to fight?

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I can not. I have but 15 minutes, and I can talk an hour about this, the most infamous proposition ever submitted to this or any other American Congress.

Tell me who is going to be exempted. There is but one class of people whom they say will be drafted, and that is the pool-room sharks. I have not heard a conscriptionist discuss the subject yet who did not say, "We are going to keep all the working-men at home, but we are going to draft the pool-room fellows." Are you going to defeat Germany with an army of pool-room sharks? [Applause and laughter.] Why, my friends, they tell me that this is no sentimental thing; this is a serious thing. You are going up against the greatest fighting organization in the world. And yet in this country they talk as though the war was to be fought with billiard balls instead of bullets. If they took all of the pool-room sharks in the United States of America they would not have an army. Under the lottery you provide for in this conscription bill 4,000,000 names are put in a box and 500,000 drawn out, and the pool-room loafer has seven chances to one that he will not be drawn.

In the vain effort to bolster up this bill, what does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] say? Now, if he can not make an argument for a proposition, nobody else here can. What did he say? He resorted to fancy and fiction instead of relying upon facts. He read here, with the evident approval of the House, figures purporting to show that one-half of the Army of the United States Government in the Civil War was 18 years old. Where did he get the figures? He said he got them from a speech made by Senator NELSON in the Senate last Saturday. I looked at them, and do you know what they show? They show that there were 1,183,130 men under 18. There were 1,158,438 men of 18. That makes 2,341,568 of 18 years and under, and as he said the total enrollment was only 2,606,000, he did not leave but 264,432 soldiers in the Union Army over 18 years of age. Who believes it? They show, further, that of those of 22 years of age there were 880,000. How could there be that many when he had left but 264,000

from 18 years up? Then I telephoned The Adjutant General's Office, and he said that there was absolutely no record in the War Department of the ages of the United States soldiers. He said that some time ago a newspaper published the statement concerning it, but it was a fake. I telephoned to Senator NELSON's office, and his secretary said he got those figures last year from the Kansas City Star. And possibly that accounts for the attitude of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. [Laughter.]

My friends, thus it has ever been. But I have an inquisitive mind, so I inquired of the Legislative Reference Bureau for what information they had, and their information, compiled from statements of men who ought to be in a position to know, was that the average age was 25, and the secretary to The Adjutant General says that a statement compiled by them, from the survivors of the veterans of the Civil War on the Union side, shows that the average age was 28. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] said, "Do you think that the patriotism of the boys of 18 has departed and they will not volunteer?" I ask him if he thinks that the patriotism of the men over 25 has departed, and will they not volunteer if he will only give them a chance? [Applause.]

Oh, no. This is universal! The only thing universal about it is the universal support it receives from men over 25 who will save their skins. [Applause.] Universal? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who preceded me, said, "Equality of opportunity." Yes. Equality of opportunity to the boys between 19 and 25, and them alone. Would he levy taxes only on the boys from 19 to 25?

They say the volunteer system would delay things. And yet every man in this House knows that under conscription, according to the department officials, it would be six months before they could put men on the training grounds. If you allowed men to volunteer and get only 250,000 in six months, you would have 250,000 more than if you relied only on conscription and waited six months.

What other argument? My good friend from Wisconsin, who tried to bolster his argument up by figures about the Civil War, turned to us and said, "You men from the South, how can you oppose this thing when the Confederate States imposed a conscription bill in the second year of the war?"

But what did he know about the forces of the Confederacy? Did he tell you that when they did that, practically every man able to shoulder a gun had already volunteered, and that in all the period from April, 1862, to the close of the war we had in the Confederate armies only 81,993 men who had been conscripted into the army, and so great was the hatred of the word "conscript" that while men were being conscripted during these years, 76,206 volunteered and went into the armies of the Confederacy of their own accord? He says if it had not been for the conscript act the Union forces would have defeated the Confederate forces two years earlier. [Laughter.] But that statement is absolutely untrue. It was not until after we conscripted men that you ever succeeded in defeating the forces of the Confederacy. [Laughter.]

What did Preston Brooks, the military historian of the Confederacy, say on that subject? He was the best authority in the United States on the subject. He said:

Acknowledging the estimate of 600,000 as affording the most favorable possible showing for conscription (a procedure which more than makes up for the manifest inaccuracies in the report of the number of conscripts), conscription appears to have put into the war not more than 25 per cent of the total. But it is unfair to credit conscription with having augmented the armies even to that extent, because the conscripted classes were confessedly almost worthless as fighting material, and no doubt the 100,000 deserters admitted by Gen. Preston to be at large were principally conscripts.

Compulsory service was, furthermore, a weakening force in that it brought conflict with the States which led to half-hearted support in some instances and did much to make service in the army unpopular. Another untoward result may be laid to the door of the system as organized—the very lax laws of exemption provided an easy and more or less honorable avenue of evasion, thereby keeping out of the armies thousands who might otherwise have been forced by public opinion to volunteer.

That is also the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, who was an officer in the Union Army, and of every other man of like knowledge. When those conscripts were taken into the ranks of the Confederacy they lowered the morale of the army. Instead of their ranks being composed of men who fought for their homes and for their country, who fought for the ideals that they believed to be right, they had been driven into the ranks to fight as slaves, and to-day in many sections of the South the words "convict" and "conscript" are synonymous.

How about the forces of the Union? An eminent historian, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, in his history—

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I regret I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That eminent historian, the President of the United States, in his "History of the American People," depicts the rioting and bloodshed throughout the country that followed the attempt on the part of the United States Government to enforce conscription. Do you think the spirit of the people has changed? It has not; and when conscription is attempted in this country, especially under this infamous and unequal lottery proposition that you have here, you are going to inspire more domestic insurrection and rioting and internal warfare than you can think of, so that it will be difficult to prosecute successfully a foreign war. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND rose.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know what my friend from Missouri wants to ask me. He has asked but one question since this thing started. [Laughter.] He wants to ask, "Have men not had a chance to volunteer now? And if they have not volunteered, does it not prove they will not?" [Laughter.] That is what he wants to ask.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I refuse to yield. I told the gentleman so. I can not yield when I can ask his question quicker than he can do it, and answer it, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is wrong about that. I want to correct him.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The answer is this: "I do not want to join the Regular Army." Not a man in this House does, and his friends do not. For reasons satisfactory to them, they will not.

Then he says, "How about the National Guard?" If he does not know it, he ought to know it, that the War Department wants to abolish the National Guard. He knows that they construed the national-defense act as not allowing them to raise additional units. They did place that construction upon it. The members of the Committee on Military Affairs asked the Secretary of War for his authority, and when he had none he then notified the States that they could raise additional units, but he accompanied that statement with the statement that he hoped the governors of the States would not authorize the organization of additional units. Was that encouraging volunteers? Only a few thousand have volunteered in the Regular Army, but if you say that is a fair test of the willingness of this country to fight Germany, you say patriotism has departed from the country and the American people do not want this war, and you thereby reflect upon the American people and upon this administration. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman vote to repeal the war resolution?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I will not. But I can defend it, while you can not defend this infamous proposition that is presented here. I voted for the war declaration. I want to prosecute this war, but I want to prosecute it with free men and not with slaves. [Applause.] I am not going to be driven by a press-conducted propaganda, as extensive and as infamous as any other ever conducted in this Nation. [Applause.]

You can not tell me why people changed overnight. I know it is because the newspapers say, "You are not standing by the President; you are not standing by the War Department." That is what the press says. The War Department and the Department of Justice have sent a special bill down here to bridle the newspapers. The newspapers denounce it, and if you dare to vote with the administration the newspapers will charge you with voting against the freedom of speech and being but a rubber stamp. If you vote for this volunteer plan they will call you a traitor. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I ask for five minutes more. Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman; I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five additional minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. They say we have got to accept what the War Department wants in this thing, because they are experts in this military business and we are not. Yet every gentleman who gets up here says "the War Department wants the age of enlistment to be fixed at from 19 to 25; but I am unalterably opposed to that. I want it raised from 19 to

21." [Laughter.] Why do they not accept the expert advice of the War Department on that?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. The War Department also wants all brigadier generals to be made major generals?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; which would incidentally increase their compensation from \$6,000 to \$9,300 a year, at a time when your people are called upon to economize and pay more taxes.

Mr. BURNETT. Do they ask for increased pay for the private soldier?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; they are going to be conscripts, and they can not ask it for themselves.

Why, they say by this proposal you will divide this country into volunteers and slackers. You will do no such thing. You will divide this country into Congressmen and conscripts. [Laughter.] The Constitution of the United States says no man is eligible for Congress unless he is over 25. You say by this thing that every man under 25 is subject to conscription. [Laughter.] Yes; we can all laugh at it now, but, my friends, you have fixed it finely. You have fixed it from 19 to 25. If any of you suffer the misfortune to be defeated, as some of you ought to be for voting for this thing, you can go home and live in safety and comfort, and say, "I will go when my time comes," knowing your time will never come.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] pictures a man as walking forth from among his neighbors when he is summoned to go, and says his neighbors will look at him as he marches forth, and will say, "There goes a man selected for distinguished service. He goes to fight our battles." [Laughter.] They may do it, but if they do they ought to be ashamed of themselves. [Applause.] There are 20,000,000 men of military age in this country. Not more than 4,000,000 names of boys between 19 and 25 will be put in this lottery box, and the man over 25 is out of it. I see three homes by the side of the road. In one home is the only son of a woman who is trying to educate him. In the home to the right there are three boys between 19 and 25. In the home to the left there is one man 26 years of age. In this lottery that you provide, one out of every eight will be drawn, and it is quite possible that that only son will be called for this distinguished service. And when he goes forth the three sons in the next house may stand on the porch and say, "He goes to fight our battles," and the man of 26, who is entirely exempt from service, may point to him and say, "He goes to fight our battles," and the mother with the patriotism of the American woman may bravely smile as she bids him goodbye, but deep down in her heart she will curse the statesmanship that so framed a law as to leave all the men and take her boy to fight their battles and suffer and die in the trenches of Europe. [Applause.]

You say your proposition is efficient, that it is not sentimental. My God! you can not fight a war without sentiment. When the people's hearts are not in a war it can not be won. They say the Prussian Army is effective; that you must have an equally effective army; that you must fight them with their own methods. Is it true? Have we come to that? Must we Prussianize ourselves in order to win democracy for the people of the world? If so, what do we gain? Have you got to adopt the methods of the Kaiser in order to win democracy for the world? If so, then may you not paraphrase a question that was asked centuries ago: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What shall it profit America if she democratizes the rest of the world and loses her own democracy? [Applause.]

The volunteer bill authorizes the President to immediately call for 500,000 volunteers. It provides that while these volunteers can select their company officers, that before an officer so selected can be commissioned he must stand the examination prescribed by the President. It provides that no man will be accepted as a volunteer if he is now engaged in any occupation that in the opinion of the President would make his service of greater value in maintaining the food supply or the industries of our country than serving his Nation as a soldier in the field. It provides further that while these volunteers are being raised the President must proceed to enroll the men of the country for the purpose of conscription, if necessary, and authorizes the President, whenever he decides that the volunteer system is ineffective, to enforce conscription. It provides further, both in the volunteer and conscriptive features of the bill, that the soldiers, so far as possible, shall be grouped into units from the States and the subdivisions of the States from which they come.

The conscription bill, fathered by the ranking Republican member, Mr. KAHN, which is the bill prepared by the War Department and which has the approval of the President, does not

allow men a chance to volunteer, but provides for the raising of an army of men between the ages of 19 and 25 years by conscription, and it would give to the department the right to have a man from South Carolina assigned to a company with men from Massachusetts or Oklahoma.

It is admitted by those who favor the conscription bill that it will take at least three months to complete a census of all the boys in the United States between the ages of 19 and 25. These boys must then be examined and the physically disqualified must be eliminated from the census. They must next decide how many of the boys whose names are on this list are engaged in occupations so essential to the maintenance of the industries of the country as to justify their being exempted from Army service and eliminate their names from the list. The names that are left must be placed in a box, and in the gamble that follows the boy whose name is drawn must go to the front.

The friends of this bill assert that it will take five or six months to complete this procedure and have these conscripts sent to the training grounds. I am satisfied that it will take 10 or 12 months; but even if they are correct, and it takes but 6 months, I know of no reason why during these 6 months we should not proceed to raise an army of volunteers and place them at the training camps as quickly as they volunteer. No sane man can argue that the Dent bill means delay in raising an army. I do not believe that patriotism has yet departed from the American people, and I am confident that they will respond to the call of their country in this crisis just as quickly as they have responded to every previous call of the President of the United States. If they do, then thousands of them will be at the training grounds long before even the conscription census can be completed. But if the friends of conscription are right and patriotism has departed from the people, and this war is so unpopular as they would have us believe, and men will not volunteer, then just so soon as that is apparent, the President of the United States is authorized by the Dent bill to immediately order the enforcement of the conscription features, and as the census will then be under way, not one day or one hour will be lost by reason of the opportunity the Dent bill will give to the men of this Nation to volunteer and fight for their country.

Nor can it be said that it will be an ineffective army. Some men have suddenly discovered that the only effective army is an army of conscripts. The history of the world disproves this statement. Human nature itself revolts at the idea. No man can tell me that an army of brave men who volunteer to fight for their country and whose hearts are in the fight, who understand what they are fighting for and fight by the side of their neighbors, can ever be defeated by an equal number of conscripts who have been dragged like convicts into the fight, whose hearts are not in the fight and who fight not through love of country but because they have to do it. They claim that the history of the volunteer system of this Nation has proved it a failure, but the argument is false. The Armies of Washington, Lee, and Jackson were Volunteer Armies. Again we have never attempted to organize a volunteer army in accordance with the selective plan provided for in the Dent bill. You might just as well argue that conscription is a fraud because when resorted to by the United States Government during the Civil War it furnished an opportunity for all of the shrewd, slick cowards of the Nation to either pay their way out or swear their way out of the draft, while brave men fought for what they believed to be right.

It is proposed to give to the War Department the power to say what occupations are essential to the maintenance of the industries of the country. Every man of any influence who wants to secure an exemption for his son is going to try to have him exempted by the War Department. The poor people of this country without influence, without knowledge sufficient to enable them to frame an affidavit, and without information as to where the affidavit should be sent even if it is prepared, will have their sons conscripted while others are left at home.

In order to secure support for conscription, efforts have been made to lead the farmers of the South to believe the bill would exempt them from service. There is not one word in the bill exempting farmers from service. The Secretary of War told the Military Committee he would not say who he thought should be exempted until after the bill passed. But what his views are can be gathered from his testimony before the committee, when he said:

So far as the present year is concerned it seems unlikely that our arrangements could be perfected so as to begin the drafting of men until after the season of planting has passed and the season of cultivation is well advanced. The season of harvest would therefore seem to be this year the one we have most to consider. The Council of National Defense would undoubtedly be constantly in touch with that situation, through

the Department of Agriculture and subordinate committees, and if it should turn out to be at all a necessary thing to do, some system of furloughing from the Army during the peak load of the harvest season might be adopted to relieve the situation.

Mr. KAHN. But if our troops were sent to the battle fronts of Europe, how would you furlough the men?

Secretary BAKER. Of course, it would be impossible under those circumstances.

Again, on page 105, the Secretary of War stated:

According to the law of chances, we would get one out of five on the farm, but we would get one out of four of those who left the farms for the city.

So, if any person is supporting conscription because he believes farm boys will be exempt, he knows that the Secretary of War, who will alone have the power of exemption, says he will get one out of five of those who stay on the farm and one out of four of those who go to the city.

Whenever a man contends that the volunteer system is a failure he refers to the Army raised by us during the Spanish-American War. He overlooks the fact that while that Army was officered by men without any military training, under our volunteer plan no man could secure a commission as an officer unless he could stand the examination prepared by the Regular Army officers of the War Department.

Some of them say that the volunteer system failed in England during this war. But Great Britain, governed by a King, and without claiming for its people the democracy we claim, did not resort to conscription until a very short time ago, and under the volunteer system it raised an army of 5,000,000 men. To me this does not look like a failure. The British victories to-day are being won by the volunteer army, not one conscript having yet reached the firing line. It is much fairer to refer to the army of Canada, the nation to the north of us, as many of our people during the years past have emigrated to the agricultural sections of Canada. When called upon to raise an army, they did not resort to conscription; they called for volunteers and raised an army of 500,000 men, sent them to the fields of Europe, and whenever you read to-day of the success of the British Army you will read of the bravery and effectiveness of the volunteer army of Canada. Great Britain has not even attempted to force conscription in Ireland, and the volunteer soldiers of Ireland, and the 245,000 volunteer soldiers of Australia, to-day compete with Canada in fighting the battles of Great Britain. Whenever conscription has been urged in either Canada or Australia, it has been rejected.

To gain some support for this draft or conscription measure the newspapers have called it the universal military training bill, when they know that the two propositions are as different as day is from night, and no universal military training bill is being considered by this Congress. But they are the wise men. In the days of the Confederacy when conscription was finally resorted to, the newspaper boys were seemingly as influential as they are now. The bill was passed in April, 1862, and in October of the same year it was amended, and it was provided that editors of newspapers should be exempted from conscription. I have no doubt they were for conscription thereafter. Now, this bill limiting the ages of service from 19 to 25 will exempt them in this war. Take, for instance, a newspaper editor of 30, physically qualified, who has been clamoring for war for two years and denouncing every man who does not agree with him in everything, he is exempt under this bill and can safely remain at home. He can not claim his occupation is essential to the maintenance of the Army. On the contrary, the Government will find it necessary to bridle them. But he is exempt. I think it unfair to them and believe they should be given an opportunity to serve instead of restricting it to boys under 25.

There is absolutely no excuse for the War Department not agreeing to the provisions of the volunteer bill providing that men shall serve, so far as possible, with other men from their own communities. The Regular Army officer can have no reason for opposition to it other than his desire to abolish State designations. He wants to have no South Carolina regiments and no Georgia regiments. He wants regiments "A" and "B," and wishes to have the right to assign men to serve where he pleases. Apparently they believe it wise to nationalize the Army. It is true that some of them say that if this bill is passed they may allow men to serve with their neighbors, but they strenuously object to any such restrictions being placed in the bill, and wish to have given to them the right to assign men wherever they please. Under the War Department's conscription bill they would have the right to assign a boy from South Carolina to serve in company "A," regiment "B," by the side of a negro from Indiana. If they did this they would not have to go to Europe for war. It is true that the Secretary of War states that in the past they have endeavored to segregate the races, and he states that he pre-

sumes that in the future it will be done, but yet there is in the bill nothing that would prevent it.

I care not what they say, my knowledge of human nature causes me to believe that if a man from South Carolina is allowed to serve by the side of his neighbors and friends from his own State, in a South Carolina regiment, he will make a better soldier than if he is assigned to regiment "A" as a conscript to fight by the side of a conscript from Massachusetts and a conscript from Wisconsin. When a man goes into danger it is natural for him to want to have his friends by his side, and if the boys from South Carolina have to go to the battle fields of Europe, if they can fight by the side of their neighbors and maintain the prestige of the State from which they came they can be depended upon to fight with the same spirit with which their fathers fought in the days gone by.

Mr. Speaker, I have given to this subject the best thought of which I am capable. I have but one object, and that is to promote the cause of my country. We are at war, and I want to successfully prosecute that war. I believe it can best be done through the selective volunteer plan. I think that 60 or 90 days should be fixed as the time in which men can volunteer, and during this time the conscription machinery should be perfected, and that it be resorted to only in case the volunteers fail to respond, and in no event until the expiration of the 90 days. But I want to cooperate with the President, and if the definite time limit can not be secured I will vote to give the President the absolute power to order conscription whenever he decides the volunteer system has failed. With this absolute power he certainly will not be embarrassed by the volunteer plan.

The way to embarrass the President and injure the country abroad is to depart from the traditional method of calling for volunteers and order immediate conscription, thus creating the impression abroad that the people are opposed to the war, would not volunteer, and had to be conscripted.

I know from my conversations with Members of this House that a considerable majority of them are at heart in favor of the selective volunteer plan; and if it shall be defeated, it will be due entirely to the belief entertained by some that the President demands the passage of the War Department bill without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." I do not believe he entertains any such view or makes any such demand. I have stood by him on every measure in his war program, and have done so because I believed he was right. But I know he respects manhood and reveres constitutional government, and I do not believe he would want Members of Congress, charged by the Constitution with the duty of legislating, to dodge their responsibility, sacrifice their conscientious convictions, and, in a matter where the lives of their people are at stake, pass a bill prepared by the War Department without any consideration. In this matter there is no principle at stake. It is a matter of policy only. I know the President would not say to us, "Yes; you give me the absolute power to order conscription whenever I decide that it should be done, but, in addition to that, I want you to say by your votes that you want me to exercise that power immediately, whether you really want me to do so or not." I have too high an opinion of him to believe he would make such a request of us. If you say, "Stand by the President," I say we are standing by him and are giving him even more than he asks for. We are giving him authority to conscript and, in addition, a volunteer army while he is getting ready to enforce conscription.

In connection with the President's views, it is fair to call attention to the statement contained in his letter to Secretary of War Garrison on February 10, 1916, with regard to the Continental Army. The President wrote:

As you know, I do not at all agree with you in favoring compulsory enlistment for training, and I fear that the advocacy of compulsion before the committee of the House on the part of representatives of the Department of War has greatly prejudiced the House against the proposal for a Continental Army, little necessary connection as there is between the plan and the opinion of the Chief of Staff of compulsory enlistment.

Again, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1916, in a speech at Arlington, he used the following words:

I have heard a great many people talk about universal training. Universal voluntary training with all my heart, if you wish it, but America does not wish anything but compulsion of the spirit of America.

I know that the President has approved of the bill drawn by the Secretary of War, but in view of the above statements I can not believe that in his heart he is very much in favor of it, and I do not believe that he will be offended at any man now giving utterance to sentiments he entertained and expressed less than a year ago.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] stated on yesterday that he was afraid some members of the Military Com-

mittee had been influenced by political considerations. This charge is unfair and unjust. I know that the members of that committee have given the most careful study to this question. They had the opportunity to hear the witnesses for and against the bill, and by a majority of 18 to 8 decided in favor of the selective volunteer plan. Three-fourths of the Democrats on the committee favored the volunteer plan and only one southern Democrat voted against it. It is supported by the Democratic Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader. I know that if a man desired to play politics the thing for him to do is to vote for the War Department bill which was approved by the President, for then he doesn't even have to think about it, but can simply make of himself a rubber stamp and say, "The War Department asked for it, the President approved it, and the press demanded it." But, Mr. Speaker, in a matter of this kind, affecting every home in the Nation and every man, woman and child in those homes, a man can not allow his action to be influenced by political fears. He can not transfer to newspaper editors, the Secretary of War, or anybody else the right to think for him. As an honest man, elected by his people to legislate, charged by the Constitution with the duty of legislating, he must vote his conscientious convictions, for only by so doing can he retain his own self-respect and the respect of the people who have honored him with their confidence.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, being in very bad voice this morning I shall ask not to be interrupted, since I may not be able to finish in the time allotted to me.

Mr. Chairman, when Congress accepted the President's interpretation of the German menace to American rights it committed itself to war. It committed itself to the support of the President for a vigorous prosecution of the war. There is no escape from that conclusion, and every thoughtful citizen must agree that if democracy and the independence and permanent peace of the United States depend upon this war it is best to wage it vigorously and to an early finish. No matter whom it affects nor how disastrously the war proclamation can not now be recalled. We are in the fight and must see it through. [Applause.]

Despite the feverish criticisms of Congress by ostentatious patriots who have thus far avoided the recruiting stations, Congress has already shown its confidence in the President, a larger and more sublime confidence in a financial sense, than has ever been reposed in any ruler of any nation. But that was only the first step in our tremendous undertaking. We must now proceed further, and from furnishing money to support the President's war policy must furnish men. It is right that Congress should deliberate upon so grave a question as the sending of American boys into the trenches, and it is right that every safeguard should be thrown around them so that the sacrifices they are to make for their country shall not be in vain. It is a solemn task which confronts Congress, this duty of contributing of its own flesh and blood to a European war, and Congress is right in not proceeding too hastily; but Congress must now do its duty and do it without flinching. It must do it speedily, but fairly and justly, with due regard to the rights and liberties of the American people first. To criticize Congress for moving thus cautiously is as gratuitous on the part of American critics as it would be ungracious on the part of foreign nations who are to be the beneficiaries of American assistance. [Applause.]

It is known to this House that our participation in this European war was not of my choosing. I had hoped the peace and happiness of the people of the United States might be preserved by other means than war. My reasons were stated in the discussions preceding the final appearance of the President to tell us officially of our peril as a nation. But all that is now behind us. We can not now dally with the past; we have decided upon war and war is here. There is no room for division upon questions which have hitherto aroused our passions or that have caused us to suspect the war was brought upon us by design. We must fight as a common people in a common cause, no matter what the burdens or the torments of war, until the permanent peace of the United States is again assured. Difficult as it may be for peace-loving and peace-deserving Americans to realize the gravity of this new situation, we must now meet the conditions that confront us with practical minds and a firm determination to win.

The pending bill is not acceptable to the President and his war experts, but discussion of it has done no harm. Throughout the debate no effort to thwart the main purpose of the President has developed. Discussion has hinged largely upon the question whether the President shall have authority to draft men for the service immediately or give them a limited time to volunteer. Ultimate conscription is generally conceded

on both sides of the debate. If the young men of America are given 90 days to volunteer, then conscription is to follow, if they have not appeared in sufficient numbers to fill up the quotas of the Army and Navy and of the National Guard. It is chiefly a question of time. Conscription is to come, anyhow.

I have read the committee's bill with some care and have noted that the minority desires to strike from the bill the paragraph allowing time for volunteers. It is with some satisfaction I note that those who volunteer or those who are drafted are to serve only for "the present emergency." It is not obligatory upon them to make professional soldiers of themselves and thus forsake life's civic opportunities. If that provision is maintained, it seems to me there will be less trouble in recruiting the young men of America who are willing to fight for their country but who do not desire to become mere numbers in a military aristocracy. Since Congress must furnish men to support the President, I am glad they may be drawn into the service with the understanding that independent careers still await them after the war is over. That is an American principle that ought to be preserved. [Applause.]

Another feature of the bill relates to the "selective" draft. I am not sure that I understand the full significance of the word "selective." The President, however, wants the "selective" draft, and the Secretary of War, influenced somewhat by foreign information, has indicated his cordial support of it. What does "selective" mean? If it spells favoritism—the selection of one able-bodied man who has no influential friends and the exemption of another equally serviceable, who has influential friends, I would oppose it. By a process of elimination it would be possible under such a system to establish a military oligarchy which would not be tolerated by a free people. I am convinced that the President nor the military authorities of America have any such purpose in mind; and yet I would prefer that we should be as fair in matters of conscription which affects human life as we are expected to be in the matter of taxes which relate to property. I realize the war, as now proclaimed by the United States, will fasten its burdens directly or indirectly upon all the people, but, so far as we can do so by legislation, we should make these burdens uniform and in fair proportion. If I vote for selective conscription, it will be with the understanding that no favorites are to be played, whether high or low, rich or poor. The man who shouted for war or who profited by war should not be permitted through influence or station to lay the burdens of war unduly upon his fellow man.

Now, as to conscription itself. Shall we wait longer for volunteers to fill up the depleted quotas of our Army and Navy, or shall we permit the President to proceed at once to organize his machinery for the draft? If peace is to be the more speedily restored by quick action, the answer to this query would suggest conscription. It is contended by the minority that a blast from the President's bugle horn would produce 500,000 men in 90 days. If I am not mistaken, the President has already called for volunteers, backed up by every influential newspaper, without producing desired results. The metropolitan press has been filled with alarms of war, frequently devoid of truth, but so startling as to inflame the public mind; but that call for volunteers has not been complimentary to the power of the pen. Mass meetings have passed patriotic resolutions and thousands upon thousands have cheered and waved the flag, but few have enlisted. Civic associations, encouraged by ample publicity, have done their best to stir up the workers of America to the enlisting point, but they, too, have largely wasted their efforts. The amusement places have been thronged with able-bodied men who rise repeatedly and reverentially as the band plays the Star-Spangled Banner, but the recruiting offices continue to beg for recruits. War was virtually declared April 2, full three weeks ago, and every agency of the Army and Navy and of the National Guard has been busy "badgering" men for the service. They have failed to make good the depleted quotas. What, then, shall be done to put the country in fighting trim? It is evident we can not fight battles with patriotic resolutions; neither can we win against a highly efficient organization like that of Germany with cheering patriots in theaters and moving-picture shows. Harsh and surprising as it may be, it seems necessary to resort to the draft. I have resigned myself to that conclusion, believing now that time is the important factor in all our efforts and that the 90 days of grace for volunteers will hinder rather than advance the ultimate restoration of peace. The House bill provides that men shall be drawn whose ages range from 21 to 40 years. It is said there is no dispute in the committee as to the propriety of these age limits. I am glad there is not, because I would prefer not to vote into the service lads under 21 years of age who have had no opportunity to vote upon national questions and who would thus be taken,

with or without their own consent or that of their parents. These minors, if not drafted, would have ample opportunity to volunteer if the bill passes as presented. I am not persuaded that any odium will attach to the man who is conscripted under the system proposed in this bill if its provisions are fairly administered. When all men between 21 and 40 years and capable of service are treated uniformly and without favor there can be no disgrace attached to the service. It is inequality and favoritism that justifies the criticism of conscription. If conscription is the law and one man thus drawn is not unduly preferred above another, the complaint against conscription falls to the ground. I shall vote to support conscription because it is necessary to prosecute the war. I shall support it because, as I understand it, the man who has been urging war will be required to do equal service with the man who has hoped the war might be avoided. I shall support it not because I am enamored of the principle, but because the war we have proclaimed must be fought quickly if the prestige, the peace, and the independence of the United States are to be upheld. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this is the best piece of military legislation that has ever been offered at the beginning of any war in which this country has been engaged. A study of its terms will demonstrate that the authors of this legislation have familiarized themselves with the lessons taught by American history and that they have carefully avoided the disastrous mistakes so common in other wars.

ENLISTMENTS FOR THE WAR.

To begin with, the term of enlistment is for the duration of the war or for the emergency, so that there is no danger that when the army which we are about to raise shall reach its maximum efficiency that its ranks will be depleted by the expiration of enlistments. No more severe arraignment of the evil of short enlistments was ever made than the following statement by George Washington in a letter to the President of the Continental Congress:

Had we formed a permanent army in the beginning we should not have been the greatest part of the war inferior to the enemy, indebted for our safety to their inactivity, enduring frequently the mortification of seeing inviting opportunities to ruin them pass unimproved for want of a force which the country was completely able to afford, and of seeing the country ravaged, our towns burnt, the inhabitants plundered, abused, murdered, with impunity from the same cause.

There is every reason to believe that the war has been protracted on this account. Our opposition being less, the successes of the enemy have been greater. The fluctuation of the army kept alive their hopes, and at every period of the dissolution of a considerable part of it they have flattered themselves with some decisive advantages. Had we kept a permanent army on foot the enemy could have had nothing to hope for, and would in all probability have listened to terms long since.

SHORT ENLISTMENTS IN OTHER WARS.

Despite Washington's warning, the same mistake was repeated in the War of 1812 when of the 527,000 men called into the service of the United States but 63,000 were enlisted for a year or more, with the result that during the entire war enough trained and disciplined soldiers could not be assembled at any one time to conquer Canada, although the largest number of British regulars in the Dominion was but 16,500 men. At the outbreak of the Mexican War the enlistment period was fixed at one year, with the inevitable consequence that Gen. Scott was compelled to halt his victorious march to the city of Mexico. He was delayed for six months in the interior of the country until new volunteers arrived to take the places of the time-expired men.

The lesson, however, remained unlearned. The first call by President Lincoln for troops to "suppress the rebellion" specified that their services would be limited to three months. It has been estimated that if enlistments had been made for the duration of the war at the beginning of the conflict between the States that the war would have been shortened by at least a year and that the number of individuals employed in the military service could have been reduced by nearly one-half, with the consequent saving in lives and millions of money. Even to the present time we are directly paying for this lack of foresight, because the size of the pension roll, which still numbers over 350,000 veterans of the Civil War, would have been correspondingly reduced if the Union had been saved by a fewer number of trained men. Let us, therefore, take credit for the prudence and economy which impel us to declare in this bill that the term of enlistment shall be for the duration of the war.

RESERVE BATTALIONS.

Next in importance to enlistments for the war as a method for preventing the depletion of armies is the establishment of a system whereby the regiments at the front can always be kept at full war strength. This bill provides for the creation of a depot or reserve battalion where the recruits for each regiment can be assembled, equipped, and disciplined, so that as casual-

ties occur at the front there will always be trained men to fill up the ranks. During the Civil War nothing of this kind was done. When a regiment was once raised by the State authorities and turned over to the Federal Government all interest in the organization ceased. The governors were more interested in granting new commissions to officers in new regiments than in providing privates to keep the old regiments at full war strength, with the result that untrained men continued to go out under untrained officers to die of camp diseases or to be slaughtered in battle through the incompetence of their commanders.

TERRITORIAL RECRUITMENT.

As a corollary to the establishment of depot battalions the bill provides for territorial recruitment, a plan for raising armies that has been adopted by every European nation, but the merits of which has never been recognized in securing enlistments for our Regular Army. It is but human nature for the soldier to prefer military service among his friends and neighbors. We instinctively dread the idea of dying alone or among strangers, and when one is asked to engage in an enterprise where the chances are that he will be required to lay down his life for his country that solemn prospect can be faced with greater fortitude if one knows that there will be some one near at hand who can at least send the word home that when the final hour came he was not a coward, but died like a man. There is nothing that promotes what the French call "esprit de corps" more than the organization of troops from the same locality, and the establishment of one or more depot battalions in every congressional district in the United States will do more to keep the army filled with willing soldiers than any other method that can be followed.

This bill for the first time at the outbreak of war recognizes the value of expanding the Regular Army and the National Guard to full war strength. Ample provision is made for filling up the ranks with recruits who, by associating with the soldiers who have seen service on the Mexican border, can more quickly be fitted for service in the field than in any other way. By following this plan we will get full value for the \$160,000,000 that has been expended as the result of the mobilization of troops within the past year on our southern boundary.

BOUNTIES AND SUBSTITUTES.

In most of our wars bounties of either land or money have been offered in order to obtain enlistments. In this war we are starting out with the theory that the Government has a right to demand of each citizen that he serve his country without being paid a premium to do so. Therefore, there is no mention of bounties in this bill. For the same reason permission is not granted for drafted men to furnish substitutes. Personally I would prefer that both of these evil practices be specifically prohibited, and I shall offer an amendment to that effect when the proper time comes.

CONSCRIPTION THE ONLY ISSUE.

We are all agreed upon these most excellent features of the bill. The only disagreement is over the question of conscription. Gen. Upton, in his Military Policy of the United States, repeatedly declares that the proper way to raise armies in America in time of war is by voluntary enlistments coupled with conscription. This bill follows his advice to the letter, but that does not satisfy those who are seeking to use this legislation as a precedent for the adoption of a system of universal military training and service in time of peace. To the advocates of conscription any recognition of the voluntary principle is abhorrent, and they are therefore demanding that this bill shall provide for a draft forthwith, without waiting to see whether volunteers can be obtained or not.

THE DRAFT IN ARMY REORGANIZATION ACT.

A little over a year ago I had the honor to prepare an amendment to the Army reorganization bill, the adoption of which caused more comment and discussion than any other feature of that act. As finally perfected, my amendment provided for the organization of reserve battalions when the National Guard is in the service of the United States in time of war, and then said:

If for any reason there shall not be enough voluntary enlistments to keep the reserve battalions at the prescribed strength, a sufficient number of the unorganized militia shall be drafted into the service of the United States to maintain each of such battalions at the proper strength.

That provision was the chief theme for Socialist orators in all parts of the United States during the last political campaign. Pacifists everywhere denounced it. I was even abused in my own State until I explained to my friends that I copied this language from the military code of Arizona, and that I believed that if such a law was good for the people of our State it would also be beneficial to the Nation.

Now, let us analyze the provision that I have just quoted. It can readily be divided into two parts: First, that if in time of war there are not enough voluntary enlistments, then, second, there shall be a draft. I was condemned as a militarist for laying down this proposition in 1916. I am supposed to be lacking in patriotism for defending this identical idea in 1917. The bill that is before the House, which I intend to support, is based upon this very principle.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS COUPLED WITH CONSCRIPTION.

The bill as favorably reported by the majority of the Committee on Military Affairs provides that the President shall immediately call for volunteers to fill up the ranks of the Regular Army and the National Guard to full war strength, and then says that if and whenever the President decides that men can not be obtained by voluntary enlistment to maintain these organizations at the maximum legal strength, then recruits shall be obtained by selective draft. There is no dispute over this part of the bill; it is agreed to by gentlemen on all sides.

The same plan for raising an additional army in increments of 500,000 is also provided for in this bill. It is with respect to these new forces that the controversy over compulsion rages, because the conscriptionists are willing to compromise by allowing volunteers to be admitted to the Regular Army and the National Guard, but they insist that from then on all new organizations shall be raised and maintained by selective draft. For the life of me I can not see why, if volunteering is thought desirable for the Regulars and the National Guard, it should be so fervently condemned in other military units. The same kind of men are to be welcomed at one place if they will volunteer but will be turned away if they freely apply for enlistment at another.

COMPULSION WHEN NECESSARY.

I am no fanatical supporter of the volunteer system. Whenever necessity demands it, conscription is justified. I have but little patience with what is called the political principle that an American citizen can not be compelled either to defend his country or to fight for the democratic principles upon which this Government was founded. In discussing this question in Arizona during the last political campaign I was particular to state on all occasions that in time of war if for any reason volunteers can not be obtained conscription is not only authorized by the Constitution, but justified by necessity.

When this country goes to war it is not your war nor my war, but everybody's war, and America has the right to say that liability to bear the brunt and the burden and the agony of the struggle shall rest on all of her sons. When that time comes no man should be permitted to pick and choose whether or not he will serve in his country's cause. We are in a great war at this very moment, a war that we must win, for if the Imperial German Government be victorious and thereby obtain dominion over the world it will be but the beginning of other wars, because humanity could not long endure the yoke.

I am not here to say that the blow that we are preparing to strike against Germany should in any wise be weakened by the failure to get recruits into our Army. There should be behind that blow every ounce of the strength of this great Nation, because the sooner the victory is won the sooner can our soldiers return to their homes and to the pursuits of peace. It is by reason of my sincere conviction that volunteers who train and fight of their own free will can hit a prompter and harder blow than conscripts that I am pleading that the voluntary system be given a fair trial before it is condemned. An army composed of men who are the masters of their own souls, men who know what they are fighting for and why, is the most effective force that we can employ to bring this war to an early and a successful termination.

PRECEDENT FOR PERMANENT MILITARY POLICY.

In addition to my conviction that volunteers will make a better fighting machine than conscripts, I have a further objection to this hasty adoption of the draft. Much as I dislike to believe it, yet I am convinced that most of the propaganda in favor of selective conscription is founded not so much upon a desire to win the war as it is to accustom the people to this method of raising armies and thereby establish it as a permanent system in this country. Every Member of the House today received a circular letter from Mr. Joseph Leiter, president of the Army League of the United States, approving the General Staff bill in toto but ending with this significant statement:

The only objections to the administration's bill, from the standpoint of the advocates of national defense, is that it does not give the country a permanent policy. There are no provisions in it by which in the future young men can be trained in peace for war.

I have never been in favor of universal military service in time of peace. I deny that it is possible to devise a complete, coherent, and defensible system of compulsion which will apply equally, honestly, and impartially between different individuals or different classes. In peace or war the time will never come

when the entire manhood of this Nation will be summoned to the colors. Unless this is done there can be no equality of service. In every drafting device it is contemplated that many shall be called but that few shall be chosen.

The only justification for conscription is that it is a prompt and a certain way to raise armies when they are needed. Disguise it as you will by the high-sounding title of "universal liability to military training and service," or with other verbal changes, to gull the public, the fact remains that the essence of the thing is compulsion to serve. We hear the phrase "equality of sacrifice" repeatedly uttered, yet there can be no such thing. One who is willing to sacrifice himself does not stop to see whether everyone else will surely do likewise. Sacrifice scorns compulsion. It springs from man's free will, and therein lies the glory of it.

A WAR TO END WARS.

No one can tell what will be the outcome of this war, but it is the devout hope of every one of us that we are making war to the end that wars shall cease. If this hope is not realized, we can at least look forward to a victory which will make the limitation of armaments a reality. Let us trust that the world will be so sick and tired of blood when this war is over that compulsory service will be unnecessary in America.

If unfortunately there should be a barren and inconclusive peace, a mere breathing spell, wherein all the nations of the earth would immediately begin active preparations to spring at each other's throats in the next great war, there may be then good reasons for maintaining a large army in the United States. Should such an evil time arrive, I shall not be found standing in the way of my country's welfare by saying that the size of the Army shall be limited by the number who will voluntarily serve in it.

THE SWISS SYSTEM.

But if a large army is necessary in time of peace it certainly should not be modeled on the plan proposed in this bill. We should in the first place follow the good example of the Swiss Confederation and dethrone the cast that now rules our military establishment by abolishing the Regular Army. Article 13 of the Swiss constitution provides: The Confederation shall have no right to maintain a standing army.

We should deny to but a few army officers a life tenure in their positions, and then if we are going to have a democratic army we should recruit into the military service every able-bodied young man in the country as he comes of age for a comparatively brief period of training, exempting no one. That would be universal service.

The selective draft does not comprehend that principle. There is a great difference between actual service and liability to service. There is too much loose talk about universal liability to service. If 10 men are liable and 1 man goes, the 1 man may give up his life in battle and the other 9 suffer not at all. That is the essence and the unfairness of the selective draft. You can not have universal service unless everyone serves. If this is done, if the reforms that I have suggested are adopted, it might be possible to have universal military service in this country without endangering our democratic institutions.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. HARDY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that if he believed that volunteering would not produce sufficient soldiers to win the war finally he would favor conscription from the beginning?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and I shall prove that such has always been the policy among every people and in every nation on earth in the crisis of a great war.

Mr. HARDY. Then, if I understand the gentleman, his opinion is that there will never be any need to resort to conscription?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; because for the size of the army that we are to raise for this war I believe that an ample number of volunteers can be obtained. At any rate we should at least try to get them before we surrender the voluntary principle.

But the kind of conscription in time of peace that I have proposed is the last thing that the militarists, who now urge compulsion, are seeking. What they want is the creation of a still larger body of military overlords, with no other profession but that of arms. They want to have the right to select and train but a comparatively small part of our citizenry who can be disciplined by years of drilling until, like the Germans, they will fight when told to do so, no matter how unholy the cause.

I pray that the result of this war will be a peace so just and so profound that the American people will not be called upon to endure even the most democratic form of conscription.

There is no virtue in military training for its own sake. Those who preach that false doctrine do so only with a view to making an objectionable dose more palatable. No one can make me believe that the barracks is a better place for a young man than his own home. I would rather trust the morals of a boy to his own father and mother than to any drill sergeant. Neither is there much virtue in the oft-repeated assertion that Army life teaches obedience and respect for authority. Men's characters are not made strong through system of discipline which breaks down as soon as the restraining force is removed.

The primary purpose of an army is to fight for the country. Let us not advance sham reasons and false purposes to explain the existence of armed forces. We resort to the draft when we can not get men for the Army. That is reason enough and we need not hunt for another. There is no need to deceive ourselves. Compulsory military service is not founded on confidence, but upon timidity; it is not founded on freedom, but upon the denial of liberty, and it should always be avoided except when there is no other way to find soldiers.

NOT A PERMANENT MILITARY POLICY.

I am very thankful that the President and the Secretary of War had the wisdom and the courage to resist the demands of their military advisers so that we are not asked to adopt a permanent system of conscription which will endure beyond the war. President Wilson, in a published statement, has said:

This legislation makes no attempt to solve the question of a permanent military policy for the country, chiefly for the reason that in these anxious and disordered times a clear view can not be had either of our permanent military necessities or of the best mode of organizing a proper military peace establishment.

We are assured by Secretary Baker that this bill is not the beginning of the practice of universal training or service and does not commit the Government to a present decision of that problem. This legislation therefore can not be considered as a precedent for future legislation which will be binding on Congress in time of peace. The bill itself clearly and repeatedly states that the armies raised in accordance with its terms, whether composed of volunteers or conscripts, shall be disbanded when the present emergency is over.

SIMILAR ASSURANCES IN ENGLAND.

It was necessary that similar assurances be given by the Government in England before the British Parliament would consent to the passage of the compulsory military service bill. I want to put into the Record the statements made by the members of their cabinet to refute any claim which may be made that England, whose example we are asked to follow in all military matters, adopted conscription during the war with a view to its continuance after peace is declared. If you will permit me, I would like to read a few extracts from the debates in the House of Commons.

Right Hon. Herbert H. Asquith, the then premier, said:

Although I am, I believe, as keen a supporter of the volunteer system as any man to be found in this House, I consider this bill to be necessary.

Later in the debate he said:

My right honorable friend fears, I am sure quite genuinely and honestly, that if this bill is carried it may be used as a precedent or as a starting point for the adoption of something in the nature of general compulsion. I have no such fear.

ARTHUR J. BALFOUR.

Mr. Chairman, we have with us in America as the head of a great commission to consider the joint conduct of the war a member of the British Cabinet, who was, at the time of the consideration of the military-service bill in the House of Commons, the first lord of the Admiralty, the Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour. Many of us had the pleasure of meeting him last night. Let us hear what he said at the time that conscription was adopted in England:

Let me repeat that I have never been one of those who looked with favor upon compulsion in any form—conscription in any form. I have never thought, so far as my knowledge goes—differing in this respect from many of those with whom I agree on almost every other political subject—that the necessity of that position had been demonstrated, and until it could be demonstrated I have always held that it should not be undertaken.

Further along in that same speech he said:

There are those who say that this is the thin end of the wedge of a permanent system of conscription. As they object, like myself, of course, to a permanent system of conscription, they say, "Do not attempt the thin end of the wedge; do not admit this small drop of poison which will permeate the whole body politic."

I believe that they are laboring under a profound mistake. I do not believe this bill is the thin end or by any conceivable turn of the wheel of fortune can be made the thin end of the wedge of the universal system of conscription.

Another member of the cabinet, Herbert Samuel, the home secretary, makes this observation:

There are, no doubt, men in this country and in the house who regard universal military service, apart from military necessity, as a good thing itself—good for the physical training of the people, good

for the development of certain moral qualities, good for the inculcation of discipline. For my own part, I emphatically do not belong to that school. Those arguments appear to me to be specious. Physical training can be given far better in other ways than by military service; moral education can also be inculcated in a different fashion with much greater efficiency; and, although discipline within measure is, no doubt, a very desirable thing in a people, independence of character is even more desirable. It has always been the strength of the British nation; and for my part I would rather run the risk of having too little discipline than of having too little independence.

Now, listen to this:

If there be any attempt to introduce compulsion for the sake of establishing a system of universal military service, I, for one, am not a party to that conspiracy, and I do not think I am its unconscious dupe.

A. Bonar Law, secretary of state for the colonies, made the following declaration in the course of the debate in the House of Commons:

NEW ACT OF PARLIAMENT NECESSARY.

The bill, as the prime minister has pointed out, takes these men for the duration of the war and no further; therefore, if what they consider conscription after the war is to come, it can only come by a new vote in a new house of commons.

Arthur Henderson, president of the board of education, one of the labor members in the coalition cabinet, clearly indicated that he supported the bill because it did not mean conscription after the war:

Let me give my reasons for supporting this bill: I do so, as I have already hinted, as a convinced and ardent supporter of the voluntary system. If, therefore, I come forward on behalf of compulsion to-night, I hope the house will believe that it is only because I am convinced that some measure of compulsion is a military necessity and because I see in it none of the insidious menaces to industrial freedom of which we have heard or read so much.

At a later date Mr. Henderson said:

Not only have the prime minister and the secretary of state for the colonies given the most definite assurance that this policy does not obtain after the war, so far as this bill is concerned, but the bill itself is so drafted that the policy it sets up can not be carried on through that same act of parliament.

HISTORY OF CONSCRIPTION.

Mr. Chairman, if the House will bear with me I want to indulge in a brief discussion of the history of conscription, because there is no better way of estimating the effect of the legislation proposed in this bill than to ascertain the reasons which impelled other nations to accept the draft as a mode of raising armies. We can only judge the future by the past, and all history teaches us that it is unwise to do anything by compulsion which can be accomplished voluntarily. I believe that I can conclusively prove that it is only when there was no other way to be found, and when the need was dire, that any nation has ever adopted compulsory military service.

We are told that Cromwell's new model army, with which he liberated England, was largely composed of conscripts; but let us see what it was that induced the great commoner to adopt the draft. By the time the war had lasted a year he found that the zeal of his supporters was insufficient to fill the ranks of the army of the Commonwealth. England must be made free from the power of an absolute monarch. As the only way to win the war which established constitutional government in England, Cromwell resorted to impressment.

THE JOURDAN LAW IN FRANCE.

The first universal military-service law ever adopted by any country was passed in 1798 by the Five Hundred, which was then the legislative body in France. The newly established Republic was threatened by a coalition of kings, and greater armies were needed to meet their onslaught. On September 23, 1798, the conscription law was voted, upon Gen. Jean Baptiste Jourdan's recommendation. It declared that every Frenchman was born with the obligation of serving his country. Young men from 20 to 25 years old were divided into five classes designed to supply the necessary conscripts, beginning with the youngest. The Government was first to call the class of 20 years, then all the others in succession, according to its needs. In time of peace the conscript was to be released at the end of five years. In time of war he might be held to the colors for an indefinite period. This law, designed to meet a great emergency, fastened universal military service onto the people of France.

THE "KRUMPER SYSTEM" IN PRUSSIA.

Prussia, defeated by Napoleon and in fear of his power, was the next great country to adopt conscription. Scharnhorst's "Memoir on the Defense of the Country and on a National Militia," which bears date of July 31, 1807, is the earliest document which sets forth the idea of universal service. The plan he proposed, afterwards known as Krumper system, was systematically put into action so that the Prussian Army came to be boastfully called "the union of all the moral and physical energies of the nation."

By a secret article of the treaty made after the peace of Tilsit, it was agreed that Prussia should limit her army to 42,000 men and should not form a militia or civic guard. Prussia had lost more than one-half of her territory and the most valuable

fortresses remained in the hands of the French. In this hour of sore distress Scharnhorst devised his plan of universal military service to regenerate the Prussian Army. By this plan the whole male population would in time pass through the army, because as the recruits became drilled they were granted furloughs and fresh men were called to take their places. Within five years Prussia had 150,000 trained men ready for the war of 1813, and they greatly contributed to the defeat of Napoleon. But by the adoption of this system the foundation of Prussian militarism was laid. This plan of universal military service, which was afterwards extended to all of Germany, is the root and source of all of the misery and ruin which has been wrought by this world-wide war.

CONSCRIPTION IN THE CIVIL WAR.

There were no pressed men in the American armies by act of Congress during the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, or the War with Spain. It was only in the War between the States, when all recognized that the life of the Nation was at stake, that the people of this country consented to the draft. The first experiment of conscription on this continent was undertaken by the Confederate Congress in April, 1862.

It has been said that in all human history no deliberative body ever dared to push its authority so far as did the Confederate Congress in the adoption of conscription. Let us see what it was that drove the members of that body to such drastic action. In the West Fort Donelson had fallen, with the loss of 9,000 prisoners. The Confederates had been defeated in the desperate Battle of Shiloh. In the East the Army of the Potomac, large and well disciplined, was ready to advance on Richmond. The one-year enlistments of the Confederate soldiers were about to expire, so that their armies were hastening to dissolution. Upton, in his Military Policy, thus describes the situation:

A month more, or two months at the furthest, and the gigantic Rebellion, organized to establish the sovereignty and independence of the States, would be a thing of the past, its leaders fleeing from the wrath of a loyal and outraged people. The situation was desperate; the crisis had arrived; the triumph of the Union was at hand.

At this juncture it was reserved for a Confederate Congress to explain for all time the meaning and extent of the power to raise and support armies. Appalled, but not unmanned, it rose to the occasion and setting an example that was followed a year later by the National Congress, resolved to meet the emergency by declaring every man between the ages of 18 and 35 a soldier. Had it been the object of the law to force reluctant citizens into the ranks, the experiment might not have seemed hazardous, but going far beyond, to conscript armies numbering more than 100,000 soldiers who had faithfully fulfilled their engagements and were already turning their affections homeward, the temerity of this legislation finds no parallel in the history of the world. But the end justified the means; the reorganization which was languishing was immediately completed; the ranks were filled up and given the strength of increasing numbers; the Confederate armies again took the field to baffle and resist the onset of the Union hosts until, dwindling to the former shadows of themselves, they were finally compelled to lay down their arms at Appomattox Court House.

LINCOLN AND THE DRAFT.

Within a year after the Confederacy adopted conscription the Federal Government was likewise forced to resort to the draft. We are told that Abraham Lincoln approved this legislation, but let us see what it was that drove him to do so. Lincoln said:

The republican institutions and territorial integrity of our country can not be maintained without the further raising and supporting of armies. There can be no army without men. Men can be had only voluntarily or involuntarily. We have ceased to obtain them voluntarily, and to obtain them involuntarily is to draft, the conscription. If you dispute this fact and declare that men can still be had voluntarily in sufficient numbers, prove the assertion by yourselves volunteering in such numbers, and I shall gladly give up the draft. Or if not a sufficient number but any one of you will volunteer he for his single self will escape all the horrors of the draft and will thereby do only what each one of at least a million of his manly brethren have already done. Their toil and blood have been given as much for you as for themselves. Shall it all be lost rather than that you, too, will bear your part?

No one can read these words of Abraham Lincoln and then say that he favored conscription for its own sake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield me more time?

Mr. DENT. Before I yield additional time I would like to make an announcement which I think would be of some interest to Members of the House. I had an agreement with the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] that in view of the large number of requests made of him and of me to speak on this bill that we will continue general debate all day to-morrow, and that I will ask the House when it adjourns, to meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning for that purpose, so that everybody can be accommodated who desires to speak. I yield 10 minutes additional to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is universally admitted that the limited number of conscripts actually obtained in both the North and the South were almost worthless as fighting material. Many of them deserted at the first opportunity and but few showed that they had any heart in the work of the war. The chief result of the draft on both sides was that this plan kept thousands of

veterans in the armies who would have otherwise been discharged and other thousands voluntarily enlisted to avoid the odium of compulsion. The laws for the draft indirectly supplied the need for soldiers, which caused its passage, but I have yet to hear of anyone who has pointed with pride to the fact that such legislation was necessary.

CONSCRIPTION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

In Great Britain we have the latest example of a free people who have been driven by military necessity to adopt conscription. After raising over 5,000,000 soldiers by voluntary enlistments the British Parliament reached the conclusion that the failure to bring every available man into the army meant the triumph of Germany with all that that implies. The issues at stake were so vital and the successful conclusion of the war so essential to the future welfare of the English people that they broke with the greatest of their traditions and accepted universal compulsory military service during the present war. David Lloyd-George, the then minister of munitions, gives all the reasons in a few words:

Those who are responsible for the conduct of this war, the most serious war in which we have ever been engaged, a war in which there are greater issues involved to this country and for humanity than any other war that has ever been waged, are advised by the military authorities that it makes a difference possibly between defeat and victory for us to secure these men. We can not find other means of getting them; we must get them immediately. * * * I would rather be driven from public life than have on my conscience the refusal of such a demand.

The sum and the substance of all of these references to history is that the citizens of no country have been willing to yield up their personal liberty and to sacrifice their individual freedom except where it was brought home to them that there was no other way to save their country. When such necessity has been proven the burden is accepted, rights are waived, and every available man is called up and made ready to go into the field to fight, and if need be to die, that the Nation may live.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have but 10 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. I will make a very short question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is in favor of the draft if it is necessary to win the war?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; if absolutely necessary.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the gentleman think that the British arms would have been more effectual and probably have shortened the war if they had resorted to draft at first instead of at last? I would like to have the gentleman discuss that proposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the British Government had done as we are proposing to do by this bill, they would have promptly accomplished every military purpose. That is to say, called for volunteers with the draft ready for action instead of getting soldiers after months and months of waiting.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman thinks this prolonged the war on the part of the British Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the universal testimony.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. The mistake of the British Government was not in the amount of men they got but because they had no safeguards around the volunteer system, and therefore they enlisted men whose services were indispensable in the industries upon which the success of the army must depend.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and I want to compliment the members of the Committee on Military Affairs for the safeguards which they have placed in this bill which do so much to perfect the volunteer system.

Mr. FIELDS. We have put those safeguards in our bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The volunteer system, with proper safeguards, should have a fair trial in this country. Until it has been tried we should, at least, preserve the voluntary principle and we should not be hasty in doing away with it.

Mr. MASON. If the gentleman will yield, I understand they are enlisting now, under present conditions, at the rate of 4,000 a day, and the Secretary of the Navy makes the statement he was enlisting more rapidly.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be true in the Navy, but it is hardly true in the Army. I desire to state in conclusion that the question before this House to-day is, has such a compelling military necessity been proven that we should abandon the traditional plan of raising armies by voluntary enlistments and secure our soldiers by conscription? No one is more anxious than I to see all those who fight for democracy emerge victorious from this war, and if I believed that nothing but an army composed of millions of Americans could bring about the destruction of Prussian militarism, which threatens to involve the world, I would not hesitate to vote to draft all the men that are needed to complete the work so nobly begun by our fellow democrats who are fighting in France. But, as I view

the situation, it is not more soldiers that the allies need in order to bring the Teutons to terms. The fighting forces of the entente powers now outnumber our enemies by over 4 to 1. It is not men, but munitions and rations, that are needed to win this war. The least service that the United States can render is to add to the already overwhelming numbers at the front.

FOOD, CLOTHING, AND AMMUNITION NEEDED.

Our chief part in this conflict, and for it we are well prepared, is to see that the veterans who have learned through two bitter years of struggle the way to drive the Germans back shall not suffer for food or clothing or for an abundance of all forms of the arms and ammunition which are required in such great quantities in modern warfare. Our people are not trained to arms, and the year that must be spent before any large number of our soldiers can be fitted for service on the battle fields of Europe might better be spent in using these same men in the production of the things that the allies most sorely need. It follows logically that if our greatest contribution to the war is to be in the form of the products of our fields and mines and factories, then but a limited number of men should be permitted to cease from work of national importance in order to become soldiers. To send such men out of the country would be not only an economic but a military waste.

MILITARY NECESSITY NOT PROVEN.

Lincoln said:

We must somehow obtain more men or relinquish the original object of the contest, together with all the blood and treasure expended in the effort to secure it. * * * We have ceased to obtain them voluntarily.

Lloyd-George said:

We can find no other means of getting men; we must get them immediately.

Can anyone favoring conscription advance like reasons at this time? No; for the voluntary system has not been even tried. No call has been issued asking for willing soldiers for this war, and if the officers of the Regular Army have their way, no such call will even be made. It is their desire that a vast horde of men shall be forced to present themselves for inspection and that out of this great number the best shall be taken to serve in the Army. This bill, temporarily at least, denies these officers that privilege by saying that those who freely offer their services shall be first enlisted and that if enough come forward of their own free will there shall be no draft. The American volunteer, under trained officers, can more quickly learn the art of war than any other man on earth. Why waste time teaching unwilling conscripts when better material can be had for the asking? Who knows how many Americans will volunteer? Nobody. The only way to find out is to try, and I want to see every proud-spirited man given a chance to volunteer before any man is drafted.

OBJECT OF THE WAR.

What are we fighting against in this war? Autocracy and militarism. We want to see the German people delivered from a system of government which lodges the war-making power in the hands of the Kaiser. But however much the Emperor of Germany might have the will to make war, he would not do it if he did not have a conscript army ready to obey his commands. Therefore to have permanent peace in the world we must not only destroy kaiserism but we must take away the facile weapon of tyranny which enables him to terrorize the world. Let us not pay Prussian militarism, which we are seeking to destroy, the compliment of adopting the most hateful and the most baneful of its institutions.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there has been much confusion in the public mind as to the purpose and purport of this proposed legislation. Many of the members, I am sure, have received letters and messages from people throughout the country urging them to stand by the President's plan of universal military training and universal military service. Some of them have said that they believed in the principle of universal obligation to military duty. There has been a propaganda throughout the country for conscription under the disguise of universal military service [applause] and universal military training. Of course no Member of this House is deceived by that disguise. We all know there is nothing in the House bill, nor the Senate bill, nor in any amendment that has been proposed, so far as I know, that relates in any way to universal military training or universal military service. The only proposition before this Congress that in any way relates to the principle of universal obligation to perform military duty is the provision providing for conscription which denies the principle of universal obligation to military service. [Applause.]

It is proposed by this plan of conscription to compel 2,000,000 men to fulfill their obligation to the Government and deny to 20,000,000 men of serviceable age the right to fulfill their obligation to the country to do military service. You strike a blow at the most fundamental principle of government and at the most sacred duty of the citizen. [Applause.] Yet it has been sent out broadcast throughout the country that some of us are opposed to the principle of universal obligation to do military service. If there are any here who do not recognize the principle of universal obligation, it must be those of you who would force the burden of defending their country on the few and deny to the many the privilege of fulfilling their obligation—that same obligation to defend their country. This obligation is admitted by all. The proposition is not susceptible of argument. It is the very fundamental truth on which human government is founded. The solemn oath to defend is born with every native and subscribed by every naturalized citizen. Nobody but an anarchist would deny the principle of universal obligation to defend his country in the hour of need. There is no issue of that kind before us and these propagandists have sought to deceive the people.

What is the issue before the House? We are at war and all agree that we must raise an army. How shall we raise it is the sole question. You gentlemen who favor conscription have the burden to show to the country that conscription is better than the system that we have followed from the beginning of the Republic. You are seeking to substitute a military plan that has never been tried by this Government at the beginning of any war for one that has given us the best armies in the world, and has been the glory of our soldiery and the pride of the American people. It was the spirit of the volunteer that has conquered every foe with whom we have contended. Yet men have charged that is a failure. Where has it failed? Not a man on this floor has pointed to a single instance where the American Volunteer Army has failed. [Applause.] I defy any man who has spoken or who is to speak, to show us where such failure is recorded in history. The only instance that I know where conscripts fought on American soil were the Hessian mercenaries, which surrendered without firing a shot, and those Hessian conscripts were made prisoners by a little band of Volunteers who crossed the Delaware on the ice in the night time. [Applause.] Where in the history of our Republic will you go to find proof for conscription? He who charges failure of the volunteer plan does not know or is not true to the history of his country.

I am in favor of universal military training. Next to these important, these immediate war measures now before Congress, the most important thing we could do would be to adopt a system of universal military training. And I am in favor, too, of universal military service to the utmost limit of the country's need. But you gentlemen who profess to stand for these things would nullify the very principle of universal obligation by limiting the opportunity to service to a very few.

Gentlemen have produced some strange arguments here in favor of conscription. One gentleman said yesterday that if we adopted the volunteer system and it failed, and we had to resort to conscription, it would be an indication to the world that the spirit of America was not in this war. If we adopt conscription now, will not our enemy have the same reason to say, right at the very inception of the war, that the spirit of the American people is not in favor of the war?

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] eloquently portrayed to this House the horrors of raising an army by a volunteer system. He said the politicians would appeal to the passions of men; that by impassioned speech they would create hard feelings in the minds of the soldiers against our enemy, and inspire bitterness and hatred in their hearts. It is that very spirit that rules nations at war and is a splendid spirit for a soldier to have who goes out to fight. What will you do with these conscripts? Will you teach them "peace on earth, good will to men," and send them across the ocean to be shot by the guns of the Kaiser, or will you have them shoot back? They say they will not enlist, that the young men of America will not volunteer. How do you know that? They have always volunteered. Never in the history of our country has the country needed volunteers but that it got them. Point to a single instance where we did not have enough volunteer soldiers to fight our battles and to win our victories.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. What about 1863?

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Does the gentleman cite the Civil War as a failure of the volunteer system? [Applause.] Did it not succeed then? Does any gentleman still think that war a fail-

ure? Did not the volunteer soldiers of the North come forward as fast as the Government could use them? Two and one-half million men volunteered and only 61,000 were drafted. Do you conscriptionists point with pride to any great victories won in the Civil War by the conscripts? Not one regiment of them was at the front in a single battle.

Mr. TILSON. Why did they pass a draft act at all?

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. I suppose they passed it to get some of the skulkers that would not volunteer. If they passed it to get soldiers, they were disappointed. The gentleman from Wisconsin on yesterday cited the draft riots of the Civil War as an argument in favor of the draft system. Now, just think of it! The conscript law of 1863 when enforced caused riots; therefore we should have another conscript law. What a pitiable spectacle this great Republic would present to the nations if we, by some unwise step now, in adopting a conscript system, would cause draft riots in the United States at the very inception of this war. Let those volunteer who will, and then public sentiment will sustain the draft of those who will not.

It was the volunteers who fought the battles in the War of 1812. Whatever degree of failure we suffered in that war, it is not chargeable to the volunteer army. It was due to the fact that a little band of miserable pacifists concluded a treaty of peace before Jackson could get his volunteers into action. And then those volunteers were so determined to whip somebody that they whipped an army of twice their size in a period of profound peace. It is true they did not know that peace had been declared, but they knew that an armed force had invaded American territory, and to the volunteer that is sufficient. I remember so distinctly the account of the casualties as given in the old school history which I studied when a boy. It was like this: "British killed, 2,600; Americans killed, 8; wounded, 13."

Another reason for conscription, urged by those who favor it, is that it takes all the men into the service on an equality. That suggestion is abhorrent to me. You take away from the man who stands ready and willing to defend his country the glory that he is entitled to. On account of that splendid spirit you have no right by legislation to deprive him of that glory. By the very law of good and evil he is entitled to it. It proves his appreciation of his obligation, and society, by its decree, has crowned that man with the glory which he has earned. Why should you seek to put the sluggard on the same plane? He has earned no such place in the public favor. It is not in the heart of him to realize his obligation to his country, and he is not entitled to be placed by law in the same class with the man who will cheerfully offer his sacrifice on the altar of his country. The volunteer is entitled to the distinction, and the conscript deserves the stigma. The decree of society in this is inexorable, and you can not change it by legislation. It is in the very nature of human government for citizens to do homage to the man who willingly defends it. Away with this false doctrine that he who is willing and he who is unwilling should by legislation be placed on the same dead level. Would you take away from the soldier his greatest inspiration and kill the very spirit of patriotism on which our Republic must depend for its defense in the hour of trial?

Let me answer those who urge conscription on the ground that the American youth will not volunteer to fight his country's battles. You gentlemen get that from the War Department. I submit that it does not take a military expert to tell Members of Congress whether or not the young men of the country will enlist in their country's cause. We ought to know better the feeling of the people than the military man who stands aloof. I am willing to defer to military authority in matters pertaining to an army, but I am not willing to defer to them as to the best means of raising one. The Constitution devolved that duty on us, and the man who votes for conscription because the President wants it is shirking his responsibility. Even though the President is willing to assume the responsibility, we have no right to evade it, and we ought to be willing to perform our duties in accordance with our convictions. I have heard Members of this House say that they much prefer the volunteer system, but they defer to the President in the matter and will vote for conscription.

I believe that men will volunteer in the Army for the war. They will come faster than the War Department is prepared to train and equip them. I believe that we should give the President the best army the country will produce, and my judgment is guided by the experience of the past when I resolve that the volunteer plan is the surest way to get it. I am guided by history, and I know of no reasons why the teachings of the past should be ignored. The Army men tell us that they know they will not volunteer for the war, because they have not volunteered in the Regular Army. It has been some years, it is true, since the regular organizations were filled to the limit, and it is

true that some special effort has been made within the last year to recruit the Regular Army, but I do not wonder that young Americans do not volunteer for the Regular Army. A life of idleness around an army post is distasteful to most of them. The young manhood of this country has some aim in life; they have hopes and ambitions, and they hesitate to mortgage their seven best years to military life in time of peace. The very fact that they will not enlist in the Regular Army in time of peace is the best evidence that they have that mettle which will volunteer in time of war. I know that some will volunteer, and I appeal to you that it is our duty to give those who are willing the chance to distinguish themselves by voluntarily offering their services to their country. We owe that to them whether few or many, and if it fails to bring to the flag the required number, then will be time enough to pass conscription, and we will have on our side the only justifiable reasons for conscripting a man to military service—the fact that he will not volunteer.

How can one who knows the histories of wars contend for conscripts? They have been pronounced by the wisest military men of the world as inferior soldiers. I say to you that you can not point out a single instance in all history where a conscript army defeated a volunteer army of equal or greater size. [Applause.] The pages of history are illumined by the recital of great battles where volunteer armies have beaten conscript armies of equal or greater size.

Look at the Battle of Marathon, where Greek volunteers defeated the Persian hosts of conscripts. Eleven tribes fighting separately each under his own chief and all under Miltiades. Neighbor fought by the side of neighbor, kin fought side by side, 10,000 men in all met and vanquished 100,000 conscripts from Persia on the plains of Marathon. [Applause.] At the battle of Valmy, Kellermann, with his little army of volunteers, made up of artisans, mechanics, laborers, and lowly peasants, met the king's conscripts and won, and from that day France dates the beginning of free government. [Applause.]

Ah, you say, this volunteer system sacrifices the best men of the country. You say that only the brave, only the very flower of young manhood, goes into a volunteer army. And that is true. You do sacrifice the best men of the country, and that has been the price that every nation and every people has paid for liberty throughout the history of the world. It is the only price at which it may be bought. If we would continue to enjoy it we must, when assailed by autocracy, be prepared to make the most costly sacrifice, that of our bravest, most loyal men.

It is true if we pass conscription at this time before a call for volunteers is made, many brave and loyal men will be taken. Men who with their fine sense of obligation to their country will serve as valiantly as if permitted to volunteer, but it is for them that I plead. I want them to have the distinction to which they are entitled. Let us not class them with the men who would not have volunteered. Let us give the young men of the country a chance to divide, so that those who come forward will be known as the real patriots and those who lag behind until the conscriptor comes may be known for what they are. Let us make it so that the patriot who falls may be duly glorified, and that those who survive may feel a pride in the distinction which they earned.

The volunteer system is the logical system of republics. Every autocracy that ever existed has maintained itself by conscription. It is the weapon which autocrats have always used to enforce tyranny. Every free government when assailed has called for volunteers. The cause of this awful war is a military autocracy, and if it can be destroyed the world will have some compensation for its cost. But let us beware that we fasten no military autocracy on this Republic. If we do, it is the beginning of the end of free government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I have been instructed by the chairman of the committee to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that in some respects I am differently situated from any other Member of the House, so far as this bill is concerned. In my canvass last fall, in the beginning of the canvass, the Republican nominee was suffering from a slight indisposition and declined to agree to a joint canvass. I went ahead and canvassed a number of my counties before he got well enough to begin his speeches, or at least until he did begin them. He began his canvass on the 25th day of October, and his first speech was printed by him in pamphlet form and sent out, and I hold a copy of it in my

hand. There you will see his picture. It is good-looking, and he is a strong and popular man.

This is no hatched-up, post-election promise or decision that I have taken. Now let me read to you what he said in that first speech. Under the head of "Preparedness," he says:

I am not a "peace-at-any-price" pacifist. I am in favor of enough military preparation to properly police the country, but to say that we are immune from militarism is absurd. I am unalterably opposed to that part of the national-defense act which Mr. Sims voted for, which provides that the President of the United States can conscript or have conscripted, in time of war, any citizen of the United States subject to military duty between the age of 18 and 45 years. He can under this act go to your home, force your boy before he is old enough to vote to join the Army, and if one of these conscripted soldiers shall make any show of violence against any superior officer he shall suffer death, no matter what the provocation may have been. That is militarism with a vengeance, and is wholly at variance with American ideals of liberty. It tends to reduce us to the standard of European customs in subjecting us to the rule of a military despotism. If I had been in Congress and had allowed this extreme militaristic influence to clutch the American people by the throat in this way without strenuous objection and emphatic protest, and had sanctioned it with my vote, I would not only retire from Congress but would never ask a free people for another position of trust.

In a newspaper published in his town a week later, a newspaper which was championing his canvass since his campaign began, this statement was made:

Mr. Sims lined up against the masses and voted for the conscription of our boys in the service and the penalty of death if they refuse to go to become gunfodder, as provided in the national-defense act. Do you call a vote compelling the sons of American freemen and the husbands of American women to go to war against their will, to be drafted into the service and forced to face death regardless of their wishes and will in the matter, voting for the masses?

When making a speech at Big Sandy on the 25th of October I was informed by telephone that my opponent had made the above-quoted statement, and I was informed that it would absolutely destroy my prospects of election if it was not contradicted and was generally believed. I stated that the statement was not correct—that I had not voted for conscription. I stated that if I had it had been sneaked into the bill in some way without my knowledge. I said not only that I had not voted for it but that I never would vote for conscription unless it was a last resort, and that there was no other means by which an army could be raised wherewith our institutions might be saved and perpetuated.

Now, how could I, in view of that preelection promise, take any other position than the one I am taking? It took all I could do by telephone, telegraph, and by personal letters, and by my own speeches to overtake that incorrect and untrue statement sufficiently early to prevent my defeat by it. And in spite of it all it came near defeating me. I was elected by only 221 majority. I think my opponent had been imposed on by some newspaper statement as to what was in the national-defense act.

Now, my friends, I do not use this fact as an excuse for my vote, but, aside from this incident, I could not vote any other way than against conscription as a system for raising our armies [applause] without being untrue to my pledged word and promise made many times prior to the above charge. If I should do so, no man would ever believe that I made that promise for any other purpose than to be elected, with the mental reservation to repudiate it when elected. I hope I have moral courage. I care nothing for brute courage only when I am dealing with a brute. But moral courage is the foundation of our institutions, of our integrity, of our judicial system, of our moral standards, and is the bulwark of human society. I will not vote in violation of my pledge if I lose the seat I hold by refusing to do so. I could not in honor do any other way than to vote against conscription in any form.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I have very little time.

Mr. BORLAND. I know the gentleman well enough to believe that he certainly reserves the right to follow his best judgment at any crisis of danger, regardless of previous convictions or previous statements.

Mr. SIMS. Well, then, you do not know the facts; that is all.

Mr. BORLAND. Do not I? Then the gentleman ought not to represent a district in this House.

Mr. SIMS. I stated in my speech—

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman is not willing to meet the danger of the moment by the exercise of his judgment, he ought not to hold a seat in this House.

Mr. SIMS. Do not make my speech for me unless you are going to change again. I said I would never vote for conscription under any circumstances, except as a last resort. This is the first war legislation presented. Would that come within the terms of my pledge and promise? We have not fought a battle; we have not fired a gun; we have not enlisted a soldier under this

act, because it is not yet a law. The implication of the gentleman's question is that because somebody else, the General Staff or somebody professing to have greater knowledge of military affairs than I have, says it is necessary to win the war, the gentleman wants me to violate my pledged faith and to follow some technical expert. If the gentleman expects me to do that, he is very much mistaken. If I did not know that the gentleman is my warm personal friend, I would regard his last statement as offensive and insulting.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMS. Surely; if the gentleman will be quick about it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The bill presented by the majority of the committee has conscription in it after a certain time.

Mr. SIMS. And I am absolutely opposed, in initial legislation, to providing for alternative conscription.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Then the gentleman is opposed to both propositions?

Mr. SIMS. I am against that part of the House bill absolutely and unconditionally. If I vote for a proposition for two systems, and leaving it to those who are to execute it to accept either, I think that it would not be a compliance with my promise and my position in opposition to adopting conscription as a system for raising armies.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the gentleman going to offer an amendment to strike out that provision?

Mr. SIMS. I am willing to offer it and vote for it and do everything I can to knock it out of the House bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then if it is defeated, will the gentleman vote for the bill offered by the majority of the committee?

Mr. SIMS. Just like it is in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; like it is offered by the majority of the committee.

Mr. SIMS. As between it and the Chamberlain bill, which I consider to be worse; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am asking the gentleman, if his amendment is defeated, will he vote for the bill?

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman is taking up my time. I know he does not want to do it. If he will get me the time, I will be glad to yield to him. I say that to provide for conscription in initial legislation is to say to the world that we ourselves have not confidence in getting volunteers enough to fight for and save the institutions of free government and democracy to the world. That is what it means. But as between two propositions that I do not like, I will take the lesser of the two evils.

Now, my friends, we are being bombarded with letters and telegrams asking us to stand by the President. Some of those telegrams and letters come from sources that utterly condemned and repudiated the policy of the administration and its conduct of our affairs with Mexico, who charged the administration with being weak and vacillating, and with being the cause of the loss of the lives and property of American citizens in Mexico. Some of these gentlemen have charged that the *Lusitania* would not have been sunk if it had not been for the weak and vacillating note-writing policies of the administration. What did some other very distinguished men who now want me to violate an honorable pledge in order to vote for what they want—what did some of them say about the President's acts and words? What did one distinguished man say? How did he characterize the words and acts of the President of the United States? He characterized them as "weasel words and weasel deeds" that deserved the contempt and repudiation of the American people. My friends, the time does not permit me to discuss all these things, but I suppose some people would not accept salvation under the voluntary plan as being too undemocratic and too unequal. The future life, the souls of men and women must be saved, if saved at all, by the voluntary sacrifice of the Son of God Himself. He came to this world and died on the cross that others might live in eternal bliss and happiness. No soldier of the cross is a drafted man. At one fell swoop in the only war that they ever had in heaven the volunteers turned out the conscripted forces and sent them to where they have been ever since. [Applause and laughter.]

But let me tell you, my friends, you must look at this thing from a practical standpoint. Now, do not mistake me. I am talking offhand. I say it takes ballots as well as bullets to win a war. Two general elections have been held for Congressmen and Senators since this war began. If it takes as long to prepare an army under either plan, as the War Department says it will, not less than 8 or 10 months, will any soldier recruited in this country except under the volunteer plan be confronting an actual German phalanx before the next election? If this war is going to be won, as some men claim it will be, in six or eight months, we will never get a man to the firing line in France, especially under the conscript system; and if the Germans are

to be vanquished in that short time it will have to be done by the soldiers of the allies who are now there doing the fighting. In one year from now there will be primaries to nominate Members of the House and Senate, and nothing could happen which would be more unfortunate than for a Congress to be elected in opposition to the war policies of the administration. When you go out with a new-born courage and seek reelection after you have reversed the whole American policy, the policy of free choice and free service for the European continental compulsory service systems, how many do you think will get back here?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The majority of them.

Mr. SIMS. That is a matter of judgment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman from Tennessee expects to be a candidate for reelection?

Mr. SIMS. I never become a candidate this far ahead.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I thought the gentleman was going to be a candidate.

Mr. SIMS. I never begin a race so far ahead.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. I will yield.

Mr. FOCHT. A high-class Member of this House said the other day that it did not matter which side you took on this question, we were all going to be licked anyhow. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. That may be true, but I do not want it to be made absolutely certain by following the advice of men who have sought to discredit the administration ever since it came into power. What was one of the first things that happened after this administration came in? It was the celebrated Carabou dinner in Washington, in which the song "We will give them the Kraag" was featured in the dinner. It was regarded as so offensive to the administration and the President that the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War reprimanded the officers of the Army and the Navy that took part in it. That was the very first thing. What did a very distinguished general in the Regular Army do? What happened to him? He was called down for making a speech at Plattsburg and stopped from making more speeches like it.

The fact is that the military classes of this country have not been in accord with the administration. What happened a few days ago? A retired rear admiral was refused an opportunity to accept an invitation in which it was generally believed that a speech criticizing the administration would be delivered.

Now, you prate about standing by the President. I voted in every instance and under all circumstances for the general policies of the administration. This conscription idea was not born in the brain of the President. He has been told, as we have been told, that the volunteer system is a failure, and that the only way to win a war is by conscription, and, believing it, has accepted the advice of military experts. It was not born in his brain. He never initiated the policy of compulsory service. That policy is as old as despotism.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman had a horse to shoe, would he take it to a lawyer or a blacksmith?

Mr. SIMS. Well, I have known a man who is both a lawyer and a blacksmith.

Mr. HOWARD. If you were President and wanted advice as to military matters, would you go to the military advisers?

Mr. SIMS. Why, as a matter of course. I said the President never originated the idea of abandoning the volunteer system on his own initiative, but by reason of the advice of the military experts, the General Staff, who have never been in sympathy with the volunteer system.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; briefly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman recall that the President is something of a historian himself and knows a few things?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; I have read some of the historical writings of the President.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Did not this bill originate with the President?

Mr. SIMS. I do not think so. I understand it originated in, or is the product of, the brains of the General Staff and of the War College.

Mr. McCORMICK. At the instance of the President.

Mr. SIMS. Here is the gentleman from Nebraska, on the Military Committee; he can tell you.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The Secretary of War stated that he drafted the bill himself, with the advice of the war experts.

Mr. McCORMICK. Did not the Secretary of War draw it at the instance of the President?

Mr. SIMS. Have not I already said that the President accepted the advice of those upon whom he must rely in time of war?

Mr. McCORMICK. Was not the President the first person to refer to the selective draft and recommend its adoption?

Mr. SIMS. I do not know; I know that the gentleman from Illinois was not the first man that ever defended this administration.

Mr. McCORMICK. No; nor to attack it either.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. MEEKER. Has not the gentleman during his past career literally taken the hide off from the fellows that did not stand by the President?

Mr. SIMS. I have; and I expect to take some more the same way. [Laughter.] But those were propositions that came from the President, were advocated by the President on his own initiative, and not depending upon the advice of experts.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. It has been stated upon the floor of the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that Congress in this emergency is a mere rubber stamp. Is not the gentleman placing the President in the same class?

Mr. SIMS. No; not at all; because it is apparent that as the military experts have got to fight the war, that their advice should not be too lightly disregarded, and that it would be more logical to follow their plan in providing for the means with which to fight the war. I have only said that, in my opinion, this compulsory service plan did not originate with the President.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman advised us to stand by the President up to the time that we got into the war, but when we get into the war he advises us all to desert him.

Mr. SIMS. No; that is not at all correct. I do not advise anyone to desert him. I am going to vote as I said I would before election, and without which declaration I could not have been elected. [Laughter and applause.] You can all repudiate your pre-election pledges if you want to, but I can not do so. I, without expert knowledge, do not believe that we can fight a successful war with the mightiest military power on earth by abandoning the old-established well-known volunteer system and adopting the European systems of conscription. I want us to win this war, and, therefore, I want the next House and the Senate to be prowar, proadministration, and I do not want us to do anything that may bring about a different result.

Mr. DYER. Is not this the time to stand by him—when we are at war?

Mr. SIMS. I am standing by the President. I voted for the declaration of war; I fought and voted against the McLemore resolution, and I thought and said at the time that a 30-day ultimatum ought to have been given to Germany as soon as the *Lusitania* was sunk. I have been as much in favor of standing by the rights of humanity and the international law of the world as any man in this House, and I believe a great and sufficient body of men of military age in this country are ready to volunteer in order to preserve and maintain the institutions of this country and its ideals, and that they do not have to be drafted, selected, or secured in any other new and untried way other than of their own volition and willingness to sacrifice their lives in order to save the institutions of our country, for which our forefathers have always fought, and for the eternal perpetuity of which we always will be willing to fight and die, if need be. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have never had military training and service, and this may cause my words to be lightly regarded when weighed in the balance with the words of the General Staff, as they are all military experts. Therefore I am going to read in my time the words of a man who has served as a soldier in the Regular Army of the United States, and therefore entitled to the weight that such service and experience gives them. The article is an editorial from the *Chattanooga News*, of Chattanooga, Tenn., and whose editor spent several days recently in Washington and has had this question presented to him in its every phase. Mr. Milton says:

VOLUNTEER SYSTEM OR THE DRAFT.

"Senator McKellar is a new Member of the Upper House, but has immediately come to the front because of his long service in the Lower House on the Military Affairs Committee. He was assigned to a similar committee of the Senate and has

been taking a leading part in the discussion of the legislation so fraught with importance to the country which is now before the Congress.

"He has introduced an amendment to the Chamberlain bill as reported, his amendment providing that an army of 500,000 volunteers shall be asked for by the President before conscription is resorted to.

"Senator McKELLAR is anxious to know the views of Tennesseans on the three propositions now before Congress. He writes:

"There are three plans of organizing an additional army before the Congress.

"The first plan is the General Staff plan, which provides for selective conscription between the years of 19 and 25, giving the War Department the right to select by conscription 500,000 young men at a time and train them as fast as they can be trained.

"The second plan is for Congress to authorize the President to call out 500,000 volunteers at once, and such others as he may deem necessary under the present law.

"The third plan is to give the President the right immediately to call out 500,000 volunteers and supplement this with the right of conscripting as many as he sees fit to secure an army. The idea being to give those who desire to volunteer an opportunity to do so, and make it absolutely certain that an army may be organized at once by giving the President the right to conscript.

"I would appreciate hearing from the people of Tennessee as to which one of these three plans they think should be adopted."

"It is a time for frank discussion of these plans, and such should be indulged in without any bitterness or rancor or the attributing of improper or unpatriotic motives to those of other views. All the Members of Congress have shown that they would support the Government in the carrying out of any plan agreed on. The voting of \$7,000,000,000 in money to carry on the war was notice to Germany that the American Nation was united. The only question at issue is how best to raise an efficient army.

"Now, let us examine briefly what is said pro and con as between the volunteer and the draft principles.

"All of our previous wars have been fought largely by volunteers. Let us see as to our own State. In the time of the Revolution the only conscription resorted to in this region was the conscription to stay at home. Before the Battle of King's Mountain twice as many men gathered at Sycamore Shoals on the Watauga River as Sevier, Shelby, and Campbell could take across the mountains, and many were forced to remain. So it was in Jackson's campaigns in the Horseshoe and at New Orleans in the War of 1812, and in the Mexican War the Tennessee volunteers were so numerous that the sobriquet "Volunteer State" was finally fixed.

"In the Civil War not only did Tennessee furnish next to North Carolina more men to the Confederacy than any other southern State—a total of 110,000—but it sent 30,000 soldiers to the Union Army, too.

"In the Spanish-American War the State furnished more troops in proportion to its quota than any other State in the Union, again sustaining its reputation.

"So it will be seen that volunteering is not a slow method of raising troops—certainly not in Tennessee—and as much may be said all through the South. But in the past volunteers from this and other States have entered the service of their country in units. Young men of the same communities and known to each other have, as a rule, formed together their organizations, which were offered to the Government. Their officers have been chosen from their ranks, often by their own selection, and the military forces thus organized have been democratic, much as is the army of France to-day. Our men resent the caste system in vogue in the Regular Army. They submit to discipline obediently, but they are not willing to be treated as underlings and to suffer indignities, such as too often are inflicted on the private soldier, causing desertions, etc.

"That they make the best soldiers in the world is attested on the pages of history covering all the wars of the United States. Of such volunteers were Pickett's men at Gettysburg, Zollicoffer's at Mill Springs, Bates's at Chickamauga, and too many others to mention. On a thousand battle fields in Tennessee alone their courage was shown. When such armies met under Grant and Lee in the campaign in Virginia, the world looked on in amazement. We may never hope for better armies.

"It is true that both North and South in the later years of the war resorted to the draft for men; but it is a notorious fact, attested by all historians, that the drafted men were not as good soldiers as volunteers, nor were the proportions of conscripts in the armies of the North and South large as compared

with the volunteers. The draft was not a success in either region. It met with resistance in the North, notably in the large cities, and in the mountains of the South it led to revolt and guerrilla warfare.

"In the camps of Southern Confederate Veterans of to-day the conscripts of the sixties are not admitted.

"The proposition for conscription is put forward under the term 'universal service.' But this is a misnomer. The words are deceptive. The service proposed is not universal. It is proposed that it shall apply only to men between certain ages—19 to 25. It does not apply even to all men of those ages. It has been announced that very few farmers would be taken. Thus at one sweep nearly three-fifths of the country's population is given exemption. They are to be permitted to show their patriotism by raising food supplies, most valuable and honorable work, it is true; but it is quite a different matter from going into the trenches. Then it is said that all munition workers and kindred industries, railroad men, miners, and others are to be exempt. Thus a very large element of working population is to be removed from any danger. Where the army is to come from so far has not been made clear.

"Neither the words 'selected' nor 'conscription' sound democratic. It should not be left to any recruiting officer to show his favoritism or yield to influence in granting exemptions. 'Conscription' depends on the principle of force. Democracy is founded on the principle of free will or consent. The draft is undemocratic, and in former days only resorted to in cases of dire need, when the national danger made it imperative. If resorted to now, some plan should be adopted by which the service is not at the option of some official, but the liability should be universal in the true sense. Otherwise we set up the tyranny of a small military class over the citizen.

"If most of the agricultural workers of the country and most of the industrial workers are exempted, we shall be bereft of the best material for an army. These classes of men make our best soldiers. The farmer is steady and inured to toil. The industrial worker is needed for the machines of modern war. It is true, as stated, that an army may be impressed from pool rooms and on the street corners of cities, but what kind of an army? The personnel of our American forces is as important as its size.

"Are we going to exempt farmers, miners, organized labor, merchants, and many other most desirable classes for recruits and recruit an army of loafers? If so, we may have to blush in shame for the showing made by the men marching under Old Glory on the battle field. No army training will change a man's character.

"And how about State pride?

"Every boy who has read American history knows how troops from different States of the Union marched together in our wars and the local pride is kindled again by knowledge of their deeds. Shall we lose sight entirely of the proud Commonwealths of the American Union? In song and story the deeds of State troops have been told. Virginia and Tennessee marched side by side in high tide at Gettysburg.

"As a method of allowing free expression of the patriotism in the American heart to-day we believe the volunteer system will be much more effective. If the States of the Union were permitted, under Senator McKELLAR's amendment, to offer 500,000 men in units of their own formation, officered by appointment of their governors, as in times past, we believe the volunteers would be forthcoming much more rapidly than the Federal Government could receive, equip, and train them.

"No matter what plan is adopted, the men are likely to be received much more rapidly than they can be made ready for the service. It will take at least six months for the organization of an expeditionary force. It should be done carefully and well.

"The United States has entered the war and ought to do its full part. We do not think we should content ourselves with mere naval and economic participation. We have made the cause of the allies our cause, and we should be willing to offer our blood on the battle field in justification of our convictions. How shall American patriotism best express itself, is the issue. Looking over the experience of the past, we must not too hastily abandon the method which has made that history possible.

"To resort to conscription right at the start in this war will be taken by Germany as an evidence of the unwillingness of the United States to furnish an army of free-will, but that force was at once resorted to, and it will be charged that our hearts are not in the war. No greater encouragement could be given for prolonged Teutonic resistance. On the other hand, if volunteers were called for and promptly furnished, the enemies of the Nation would have before their eyes additional evidence

that Uncle Sam intended to do his full share in bringing the war to a successful conclusion.

"The President has very strong influence with Congress and a wonderful power over the Nation. He has been led to take his position by the advice of the military advisers about him. They are honest and sincere in their convictions, of course, and he is patriotic to the utmost degree. But, on the other hand, those at Washington are not always best qualified to advise in a matter of this kind. The American people are unaccustomed to drafts or conscription, however sugar-coated they may be. The words repel. They come of dire need and are out of the system of autocracies. An immediate draft would frighten the Nation as to what might be the future. Would the next step be martial law, suspensions of constitutional rights of various kind, rights of free speech, free press and petition? The President should realize that the eastern press is not a safe guide. It has always fought him. Now, its advice may be dangerous.

"Expressions through telegrams, letters, and mass meetings may not always be safe guides, either. The greater number of people rarely declare themselves in such a way.

"Many of these telegrams and letters are written by persons of the classes exempted by age or occupation. Some of these possibly would volunteer in case that plan is adopted, but at least they might so signify before urging legislation which will keep themselves at home and send others out into the places of danger at the front.

"In many other cases due consideration has not been given to the question.

"Congress has become so sensitive to these surface manifestations of sentiment, so frightened at possible disapproval, that it no longer frankly voices the convictions of its Members. When the administration takes a position in opposition to Congress it is able to set a great back fire among the constituents of Members, and they usually yield. Congress, therefore, frequently of late has been dubbed a 'rubber stamp.' This is not as was intended by the fathers of the Constitution. The Members of Congress ought to vote their honest convictions. When they fail to do so we may well consider some other form of our Government. The legislative is equally clothed with authority along with the executive. Either branch may be in error. It was because of the disposition of human beings to err that a system of checks and balances was devised by the founders of our Government. If it is broken down, then free institutions may perish.

"The volunteer plan is not aimed to prevent promotion of Regular Army officers. Since it is proposed in any event to increase both the Regular Army and the National Guard to the full strength, there will be need of many additional officers of high rank and promotions naturally will follow. But there are now not enough trained officers in the United States to command the first army. For the second army of 500,000 officers must be appointed from civilian life, and most of these will have to be trained. It will not affect matters at all whether they are raised by volunteering or by the draft. The only difference will be in the manner of appointing officers.

"As a last objection to conscription or universal military training we may mention with regret that the South particularly has a peculiar race situation. All is quiet now, but we live over a volcano. The relations of the races are most friendly. We wish them so to remain. Perhaps it would not be dangerous to the South to give military training to millions of colored citizens. We are not blind to the fact that they are patriotic and have made good soldiers in the past. But we must not overlook all possibilities. The day would come when they would return to their homes. In many regions of the South they are in the majority. They might be unwilling to live under conditions now quietly accepted. An apple of discord might thus be thrown in our midst, and scenes like those during reconstruction days follow. Also, if universal service is applied, how may the fourteenth amendment be ignored? Under that blacks would go into ranks alongside whites. Congress should very gravely discuss this phase of a question which seems to have escaped attention.

"For the above, as well as many other reasons, it is sincerely to be trusted that Congress will be very cautious as to this legislation."

It is claimed that the General Staff plan is democratic. If so, it is the democracy of servitude. Many slaveholders have been democratic in the treatment of their slaves. They have treated them all alike, have not discriminated between them; but were they any less slaves on that account?

In order to win this war in the quickest possible time I am opposed to experimenting with European compulsory military systems. We know what we have done and what we have accomplished in the past by the volunteer system of raising and maintaining armies, and our experience gives us confidence as to what

we can do if we stand by our time-tried war-tested American volunteer system.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have so far taken no time in the discussion of the great questions coming before Congress at this session. However, I feel it now to be my duty to say a few words as to my position upon the questions now at issue. This Congress has voted, in both Houses, by an overwhelming majority, for a resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States. I was one of the minority who voted against that resolution; not because I did not think there was ample cause why we might declare war, but because I had been hoping against hope that this country might be spared the terrible scourge of war, and because I did not wish to be held responsible in any degree for bringing about that great catastrophe. My conscience upon that question and on that vote is clear. I hate war and hoped it might be avoided. I have no apologies to make for my vote upon that resolution and no regrets. I represented, as I believed then and as I believe now, the great majority sentiment of the people of the district I represent. But conditions have changed. We are at war, and every Member of this House who voted for that resolution and every Member who voted against it, for that matter, knew at the time that if that resolution was adopted it would be necessary for us, in common prudence, to provide a great Army; and I think he knew that under existing conditions and the feeling of the people, it would be impossible to provide such an Army as we ought immediately in common prudence to have under the old volunteer system or without some provision for compulsory service. I believe that every American citizen, especially in times of war, owes to his government whatever service may be required and which he may be able to render. I do not like the word "conscription," and that seems to be generally objectionable; but every citizen is liable to conscription for civil duty. No court in the land that has a jury calls for volunteers. It has a system of selective conscription, and men are compelled to serve. They may be excused, perhaps, for cause, but if there is no cause they are compelled to serve in civil life, and they should be compelled also in times of stress and in times of war to render any service the Government may need. I think this is the hardest question I have ever been required to vote upon.

Under existing conditions I am in favor of and shall vote for the selective-draft plan, as proposed by the President and the War Department. I do not believe it will be possible at the present time to raise such an army as we ought to have, in order to protect our coasts alone, and our insular possessions, by the old volunteer system. Oh, I know, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] has said, what a great army we raised during the Civil War by the volunteer system. It was a great, a wonderful, a patriotic host of brave and loyal men.

I also know that North and South, after those armies had become trained and hardened and used to the service, no better or more efficient armies ever fought a battle or ever trod the earth. However, thousands of lives were needlessly lost before they reached that condition of efficiency and before the men were fit for service. However, those volunteers, especially in the later years of the war, did not always volunteer so disinterestedly as a great many seem to think. I am old enough to remember those days of the Civil War, and know something of how the armies were raised. They did not all volunteer from purely patriotic motives. In the little county where I lived at that time, and where I live now, the people of the entire county almost bankrupted themselves in raising money to pay bounties to induce men to enlist, and oftentimes, especially in the early days of the war, the men who volunteered to go were those who could least be spared. In one little country township 6 miles square, where I then lived on a farm—and there was not a village in the entire township—123 boys went into the war, and the old men and the women and the children were left to cultivate the soil and to raise the food that was necessary. I believe now that it is the duty of every American citizen to stand by the administration in this war, whether we were for a declaration of war or against it. A great many people do not yet seem to realize that we are actually at war and what it may mean. The Almighty alone knows what the end will be, how we may come out, and when and where. I have voted for the past two years for every measure for adequate preparedness that came before this body, because I thought it better to be prepared than to be sorry, and I only regret that we are not now more and better prepared. If we had been, I think Germany would have thought twice or thrice

before she brazenly defied us. If we had had a great Army and a great Navy and were prepared for war, as we should have been, I do not believe we would have had any war. Many think that this war will not amount to much anyway; that it will only be the expenditure on our part of a few billions of dollars and a little more taxation for everyone, and that we shall not suffer any of the actual hardships of war. That reminds me that at the beginning of the late unpleasantness between the North and the South it was said that Gen. Bob Toombs, of Georgia, remarked that the South could whip the North with popguns. After the war was over he was reminded of that remark. Some one said to him, "General, I thought you said that we could whip the North with popguns," and the old general blurted out, "We could, we could, but the damned Yankees wouldn't fight with popguns." [Laughter.]

And it has been pretty well demonstrated that the Germans are not at present fighting with popguns or golf sticks. We do not know what we may have to meet, but we do know that we ought to be prepared, and I say now that I believe we ought in the shortest possible time to raise a great army, at least sufficient to protect our shores from invasion and our insular possessions. We can not, in my judgment, do that by the volunteer system, and therefore I am decidedly in favor of the system recommended by the President and the War Department, and I believe now that it is the duty of all American citizens to stand by the administration and render every service possible and give every aid possible in the prosecution of the war. We have but one country, the United States, and but one flag, the glorious Stars and Stripes; and to them every man owes allegiance and the best service that he can possibly render. When we go into a war, like the present war, the greatest, the most terrible, ever before known since the world was created, we should, like our heroic ancestors in the days of the war for independence, each and every one, be willing to "pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." [Applause.]

We have given to the President, in the resolution adopted by such an overwhelming vote, a pledge of all the resources of this country, and we have not only authorized him but we have directed him to use the entire Army and Navy of the United States and the resources of the Government in prosecuting the war against Germany. Now, having done that, I insist that we should back up the resolution and furnish him with all the means and with all the men necessary to prosecute that war to a speedy and successful termination. I believe it is a duty we owe to our Government, and I can not understand how any man who voted for that resolution for war can now justify himself in hampering the administration and in refusing to give every aid possible in the prosecution of that war, which will be won, if it is won, by American resources and American arms. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, from the remarks of some gentlemen on this floor it would seem that in the minds of some men there is more importance attaching to the election of Members to Congress than to the necessary preparation for taking part in the greatest war in the world's history. Personally that matter may be of some importance to individual Members, but how it pales into insignificance when compared with the great world-wide question which we are considering. How paltry are such considerations in the presence of such a task. What matter our political or personal fortunes? They ought to fade from our minds and disappear from our consideration. [Applause.]

War is no pink-tea performance. As a matter of fact, it is the most damnable business in which mankind can possibly engage. Gen. Sherman was mild and conservative in his choice of language when he described war in his most famous utterance, and we have entered into that hell. I hate war with all the fervor of my being and am grieved beyond the power of expression that this country is in war. Yet with all my hatred for war, on the only two occasions in my life when it was possible for me to have served under the flag of my country in a war or a near war I accepted the duty and volunteered. [Applause.] I did not do it because I am fond of war, nor because I sought the hardships of the camp or the march. In both instances there was present the compulsion of duty. I scarcely need to add that if my services shall be needed in this present war, although I have passed beyond the limit of the age suggested in this bill, or in any bill for compulsion, of course, it goes without saying that my services are again at the disposal of my country. [Applause.]

I am very much in favor of universal military training and am genuinely sorry that this bill does not carry in it provisions to that effect. If it carried such provisions, it would show to the world, and especially to our enemies, that hereafter we mean business; that whatever may have been our past mis-

takes, from this time forward we are going to prepare ourselves to protect ourselves and our rights in the best possible way. However, the President and Secretary of War have thought that this is not the proper time to ask for that legislation and so it is left out of this bill. We all realize that nothing can be done in this emergency along that line unless it has the approval of the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

This is an emergency measure. It is so stated in the bill. It provides that it shall not remain in effect after the emergency is over. It is a great emergency, the greatest in our history, and we all wish to adopt the very best means possible to meet that emergency. The only question between us is which is the best plan? I agree that gentlemen who favor the volunteer system are just as patriotic as I; that they desire the welfare of the country just as much as I. We differ only as to methods. The volunteer system, they say, should have a trial, and yet in the bill which the majority has brought in the draft provision is coupled with the volunteer system in such a way that volunteering does not have a fair chance. On the part of the majority of the committee there was a commendable disposition to compromise, as is usually necessary in matters of legislation. With the best intentions in the world the proponents of this bill have compromised themselves out of court, practically, because there is no sound foundation upon which the bill as written can rest. If a purely volunteer bill had been brought in, manifesting full confidence in the American people that they would fight this war to a finish by volunteering, that would have been one thing. At any rate, that would have been meeting the issue fairly and, to my mind, far more wisely than to say we will have volunteering only while the President is getting his lists ready to have a draft. [Applause.] Is that a fair trial of the volunteer system with a draft feature already enacted and in the hands of the President hanging over them? That is not a trial of the volunteer system at all.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield for one interruption?

Mr. TILSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does not the present bill of which the minority approve hold that same threat of conscription over men that you propose to take in the Regular Army and National Guard? Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. TILSON. That is entirely a different matter, for this reason: Let no one try to deceive himself into the belief that we are trying a volunteer system in the Regular Army or National Guard at all. That is a different matter altogether because those organizations are already formed and in existence. The officers are all appointed and the noncommissioned officers. All that is necessary is to fill them up to the proper strength and this is going to be done in the same way it has been done before.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. You criticize the majority of the committee because we brought in a bill that does not stand absolutely for volunteering. If you believe in conscription, why did not you stand for absolute conscription at once instead of for volunteering while you were getting ready your conscription?

Mr. TILSON. I think there is a good enough reason for that. There are going to be some boys below the age of 21, provided in this bill, who will wish to volunteer, and it may be perfectly proper that they should volunteer. They will make good soldiers. This will give them a chance to come into the Regular Army or National Guard. Then, as I said to the gentleman before, these are organizations of which the units are already in existence. They only need to be filled up, and having been filled, as they have been, by the volunteer system up to this point, it is thought by our military advisers better that those particular organizations should be filled up by volunteering. At any rate, we are spared one great fault of the volunteer system, the acceptance of untrained officers in new organizations.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask the gentleman how many eligibles will be in the class of 21 to 40 if conscription is in force?

Mr. TILSON. There will be a great many millions. I have not the exact figures in mind, but something like 15,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman approve of the conscript class extending between the ages of 21 and 40 when there will be so many more eligible for conscript than what is conceived as being necessary at the present time for service?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes; because I think that is the fairest and most efficient way to make the selection.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there were 20,000,000 eligible between the ages of 21 and 40 he would still believe they should be drafted, even though 20,000,000 would be in the lottery class?

Mr. TILSON. We do not know but we may need every man of the 20,000,000 before it is over. What is going to be the situation if we start with a volunteer system, asking for 500,000, and, as soon as this 500,000 have been enrolled, then the President decides under the provisions of the majority bill to enforce the conscript provision? By doing this we are placed in the position of having 500,000 volunteers and 19,500,000 slackers, if they shall be needed and shall later be conscripted under the bill as it now stands. I do not believe in making that distinction. I believe in starting right at the beginning and selecting the men that the Government thinks should serve, leaving the others subject to call, of course, up to the limit of the 20,000,000 that the gentleman refers to. That would be my plan.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman has stated that under the plan of the General Staff it is proposed to fill up the Regular Establishment and also the National Guard by voluntary enlistment. Can the gentleman give the committee the number that it is proposed to increase, in both the Regular Army and the National Guard in that way?

Mr. TILSON. It will be substantially a million in the two. The Regular Army will be close up to 300,000, and the National Guard will be something over 600,000.

Mr. GOOD. Not a million in addition to those that are already in the National Guard?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, no; all told.

Mr. GOOD. My question was, How many additional volunteers for each branch of the service will be called?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, there are now, roughly speaking, 135,000 Regulars, all told, and a little more than that of the National Guard. So there will be about 600,000 more to raise.

Now I desire to pass for a moment to the experience of the Civil War. That has been discussed back and forth so fully that I enter upon it with some little hesitation. In my judgment we do not study history aright if we conclude, because those men who volunteered for service made good soldiers on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line, that therefore the volunteer system was right or effective. We should draw a distinction between the volunteer and the volunteer system. It is not the volunteer that I condemn, because he was always a good soldier—of course he was and always will be—but it was the inefficient system which did not wisely utilize the man power we had. That is why I object to the system.

What happened in the Civil War? Mr. Lincoln called for troops. Men from all over the country rushed into the first quota upon a short enlistment. How were those regiments formed, and how were the volunteer regiments formed all through the war? They were formed by prominent men of the community. Politicians, somebody has said—although I have nothing against the politicians—rushed in to raise regiments. The big politician was made colonel, the lesser lights majors, the still smaller captains, and so down to the small fry in the lower offices and noncommissioned offices. That is the way the regiments were raised all over the country. That was the system. I do not condemn anybody for raising a regiment that way. If that is the way it must be done such men are to be highly commended. If the majority bill should go through I may possibly ask to raise a regiment myself, much as I oppose the system which will permit that to be done. That was the way it was done in the Civil War. It is the only way it can be done under a volunteer system. What happened? Men without knowledge of the soldier's duties, men who had no training whatever, went out as officers in those regiments. Most of them did not know the first principles of being officers. They did not know how to take care of themselves, much less their men, and although they were good and capable men and finally did learn the business of soldiering, it was at great sacrifice of blood and treasure that they learned the lesson. While they were learning it the personnel of their regiments dwindled by camp diseases and by casualties in battle until by the time the regiments were thoroughly trained they were mere skeletons of regiments—often only 200 or 300 men. Read your war records and you will see that I am not painting a black picture at all, but stating actual facts. Would new volunteers come in to fill up those skeleton regiments? Not at all.

The only way that they would come in was by other politicians or somebody else going out and raising new regiments, with new officers. Could anything be more unwise or more nearly suicidal than what actually happened? The old regiments, with their trained officers and veteran soldiers, had to be disbanded. Many of the officers who by long service and at fearful cost had learned the business of war were retired to private

life or given less important duties while new and untrained officers were in command of organizations. These in their turn, and at the same fearful cost, would proceed to learn the duties of command. So it went on from the beginning of the war until 1863, when it became impossible to raise the volunteers even in that way, and the draft followed. In the southern Confederacy it was used a whole year earlier, but not until the mischief had been done.

Ah, gentlemen of the House, that is the history of the Civil War when stripped of rhetoric and Memorial Day persiflage. The same thing happened in the Spanish-American War, although the consequences were not so fearful on account of the smallness of that war. I was a volunteer in the Spanish-American War. That is the way my regiment was formed. They were as fine a lot of men as ever served their country who became officers in that regiment. There were a few of them who had had a little military experience. I myself got into the regiment as a second lieutenant because I had had one year's experience as a private in the ranks of a National Guard regiment. The colonel was so eager to have an additional officer who had had some prior experience that he saw to it that one second lieutenant was not accepted in order to give me a chance to get in. He wanted at least one officer in that battalion who had had a little military experience.

Mr. LITTLE. Is that the military experience you had, with the militia?

Mr. TILSON. That was the extent of my military experience prior to the Spanish-American War.

Mr. LITTLE. Do you call that "military experience"?

Mr. TILSON. I do not care what you call it. That is what I had. [Laughter.] That was more than the others had, so that it made me the best available drillmaster, because I had been a private for one year. That is the way that regiment was formed, and that is the way the others were formed. That is just the way regiments will be formed if the majority bill becomes a law. It is provided in it that they shall be raised by organizations. You can not raise volunteers in any other way, so that if you vote for this bill as it is drawn, this mongrel, hybrid bill, which is neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring, that is just what you will have. [Applause.] It is the only way you can get your men, and then you will start in with a fearful experience, like the Civil War and just as we had it in the Spanish-American War.

Do you want to do that? I do not. Whether my seat in this body is at stake or not, that makes no difference to me. I do not believe that is the best way to fight this war, and whatever the sacrifice may be, I shall not support any such measure as that. Instead of "conscript" being a term of reproach as we have heard so often, I do not believe that there will be any such opprobrium attached to the men who are selected under the selective-draft system. I believe that instead of calling it a "conscript army," we should give it a new name. We should take the word that is most prominent in this bill, "selective" draft, and call these men who are selected and called out from among their fellows a "selected army," for that is just what it would be—a selected army. These men are selected, and the others are kept in reserve to be called if needed when their turn comes.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] this morning painted a very gruesome picture of the conscripting officer coming into a community where there was one man 27 years of age and three boys of one family between the ages of 19 and 25—which is not in our bill, by the way—and one son, the only son of a dependent mother. The names of the four eligibles are put into the wheel and the lone son, of course, comes out first and he is chosen. Then the gentleman pictures the pain of that mother as she is giving up this lone son while the man of 27 goes free and while the three sons all remain at home.

I suppose if the volunteer system were in vogue the chances would be ninety-nine out of one hundred that the lone son would be one of the first men to volunteer, and then it would be put up to that poor mother to decide whether she would permit him to go or refuse, and thus stand in her country's way. By the system of selective draft we provide for just such cases as that. Where there are dependents there are to be exemptions, and so under our plan this lone son with a dependent mother would be exempted by law. Then he could look his companions in the face and say that he had not been chosen at all, but had been exempted by the law itself. After all, what difference does it make to the mother whether her son is selected for duty or whether he volunteers and goes? What is the difference? He is gone from her in either case. A selective draft properly administered would require him to stay at home. Here is the practical situation, and here is just what the gentlemen who are favoring this volunteer plan are standing up for: Let us

assume, first, that all men of military age are willing to serve their country, just as they should be. If we select a part of them to go out and serve, what harm have we done to anybody? [Applause.] They are all willing to go. We have selected only a part of them to go out for the time being because that is all we can use. The rest may have to follow later.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. In a moment. But supposing a part of them are willing to go and a part of them are not willing to go, as might be the fact. Then to whom do we do the harm? Certainly not to those who are willing to go, because if they are chosen by selection they go just as they would go if they were volunteers. Then who are left to object? Only those men who are eligible, who are of proper military age, who have no one dependent upon them, and yet who are unwilling to go. Are those the men we wish to agitate about? [Applause.] When we reduce it to cold facts, gentlemen, those are the only men you are exercising yourselves about. [Applause.] The word "volunteer" sounds grand. It really sounds fine to say that in 48 hours enough men will spring to arms—if we happen to have the arms to spring to—to defend the country. It sounds so grand that we like to repeat it, but it is more rhetorical than practical. What we are dealing with in this bill is a cold, practical proposition of the best way to go about an immense task. It has been proven by our own history and the history of other countries that the volunteer system when thoroughly tried out has never produced the best results. The Civil War, instead of proving that the system under which it was fought is a wise one, only shows what brave and patriotic men can do in spite of a bad system. If the selective plan had been used from the very beginning, in my judgment the war would have been finished with half the sacrifice of blood and treasure, and possibly in half the time.

Mr. LITTLE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TILSON. I yield for a single question.

Mr. LITTLE. Is not the fact exactly the contrary, that every war this country has ever won was won by volunteers, and that no army of conscripts ever won a victory for this country or any other?

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman calls the soldiers of France and Germany conscripts, and I suppose he does, they have been winning some victories on both sides.

Mr. LITTLE. Have their conscripts won the war for either of them in less time than the Civil War was won by volunteers?

Mr. TILSON. Not yet; but probably, there being conscripts on both sides, the conscripts on one side or the other are going to win.

Mr. LITTLE. That may depend on the Americans. You say both armies in Europe are conscripts. Have they got any better results than the volunteers got for this country in 1861-1865?

Mr. TILSON. It makes my heart bleed when I think of the unnecessary losses in 1861-1865. When I think how those brave young men were sacrificed and slaughtered, while their equally brave but untrained officers were learning how to lead them, I pray that we may never repeat the error. Then think of this country, drenched in blood for four years, when much of it might have been saved. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. And the conscript systems of Europe have sacrificed ten times as many men in half the time.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, I differ with the gentleman. I am very sorry that the conscripts or anybody else are fighting in Europe. I began my remarks with stating how sorry I was that there was any war, and especially that we were in it. But we are in it, and we are facing a practical question.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman claims that the volunteers of the Civil War were sacrificed. Were they not sacrificed by officers of the Regular Army, and is it not a fact that the successful issue of the Civil War came as a result of the skill of volunteer officers, such as Grant?

Mr. TILSON. Many volunteers became fine officers, but the gentleman is unfortunate in his reference to Gen. Grant, who was a Regular Army officer.

Mr. STAFFORD. And was it not Regular Army officers like McClellan who sacrificed the volunteers?

Mr. TILSON. Unfortunately great battles can not be fought without sacrificing men. That is one of the things I dislike about war.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Grant was a graduate of West Point.

Mr. STAFFORD. Gen. Logan was not a West Pointer. He was a volunteer, and Oglesby was another volunteer.

Mr. FESS. And Gen. Grant left the Regular Army service.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen must not interrupt except by the consent of the Member who has the floor.

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] for just one question.

Mr. FESS. Gen. Grant was a volunteer, having left the Regular Army six years before the war broke out, and he got his commission from Gov. Yates, of Illinois.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, Gen. Grant was a West Pointer.

Mr. FESS. Certainly he was.

Mr. TILSON. He had been in the Army for a number of years.

Mr. FESS. But he had left it, and he was a volunteer.

Mr. TILSON. I have not said anything against the volunteers. I have been singing their praises and the brave deeds they accomplished under a wasteful, ineffective system.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Was not this volunteer, Gen. Grant, not only educated at West Point, but was he not a veteran of the Mexican War?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. There can be no question about our volunteers fighting bravely and making the greatest of soldiers. A number of them rendered distinguished service as officers of high rank, but, unfortunately, not a very large proportion of them became great generals in the Civil War. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to state very briefly my position as to the two systems for raising an army now under discussion. I am going to vote for the selective draft system which carries with it the recommendation of the President of the United States. [Applause.] It is the most democratic, applying to the rich and the poor. It is the most efficient, because with it is carried the well-defined policy of the President to keep going those activities in our country which are essential to its very life.

In my district there is now being waged a magnificent campaign for food preparedness. My people are thoroughly aroused. The business man, the banker, and the farmer realize the field for patriotic service in increasing the food supply. Vacant lots have been turned into gardens; over 10,000 children in the city of Memphis are daily working gardens; manufacturers have cleared away acres of rubbish and planted potatoes; on the farms, where heretofore every acre has been given to cotton, many hundreds of acres have now been planted in foodstuffs. Everywhere there is aroused a patriotic demand to increase the food supply, and the finger of scorn is pointed to those who do not join in the fight. We all admit that to win in this war we must also win in the fight to raise more meat, more food, as well as men and ammunition.

Under the volunteer system havoc would trail in the path of the Nation's farm and food campaign. The men working away in the fields, hearing the call of their country, with hearts swelling with patriotism, would enlist and stop the very necessary work that they are doing.

Under the selective plan the Government would say:

You are doing an equally patriotic service. Some of you must keep at work, increasing the food supply, for hungry men can not fight.

I believe the people of the United States have implicit confidence in the President, and they are looking to his able and clear-headed leadership to guide this country through the dark, trying days ahead. I know full well my people are solidly supporting him and his policies. They are now impatient when any obstruction is placed in the path of his policies being put into force. They trust him absolutely and they expect of me that which I am eager to give him, my whole-hearted and unqualified support. [Applause.]

It seems the natural and reasonable course to pursue, with an able commander in chief of the Army, who has carefully considered the two systems, has reached a conclusion, and has made a specific recommendation, that we should follow him. There can be no doubt that he wants the selective conscription system, because in his matchless address at the opening of Congress, when speaking of how serious a step a declaration of war would be, he said:

It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least 500,000 men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training.

And again only a few days ago in a published letter he made this statement:

The process of the draft is, I think, very clearly set forth in the bill drafted by the War Department and which I so earnestly hope that Congress will adopt; but it is worth while to state the idea which underlies the bill a little more fully.

Can it be said that we are standing back of him and supporting him when he specifically says he "earnestly hopes" Congress will adopt the selective draft system, and it is not given him? It will be a very difficult proposition to explain back home that you stood by and backed him up when you spent hours fighting the measures he recommended and "earnestly hoped" you would vote for.

About 17 years ago, as a student under the then professor of Princeton University and now our President, I found out that he had a very great capacity for reaching correct conclusions. I have watched his career very closely since then, and I have now the same belief in his capacity, and in that belief I am joined by my constituents. [Applause.] I firmly believe that the President is the greatest man living to-day. He has given very careful thought and study to these two systems. His conclusions are backed up by the Secretary of War and all the military experts of our Army. He believes "the supreme test of the Nation has come." He asks us "to speak, act, and serve together." There may be some of you who will desert him in these trying hours, but the path of duty for me is clear. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, our country is now engaged in war with a foreign foe. I was one of that small minority of this House who voted against entering this conflict. But since the result of that vote was announced I have never allowed myself to entertain even a doubt as to the righteousness of our position.

We as a Nation have passed from the sphere of propriety into that of necessity.

The former permits of divergent views on each and every question; it permits of endless discussion and debate; it even tolerates friendly jest and criticism of the proponents of any proposition.

But in times like the present I believe we should, at least in great measure, subserve our ideas to the recommendations and suggestions of those who are intrusted with the responsibility of prosecuting this war.

They have before them, or at their disposal, information and data which the average Member of Congress does not possess, and much of which he could not, even if he so desired, acquire.

The President, as Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces of the United States, has invited Congress that in order to be successful in this war we must place all our resources at the country's service.

Congress was prompt in providing the necessary funds; it has given tacit consent to the mobilization of our industrial and commercial forces; it has interposed no objection to the mobilization of our battleships; and why should we not display the same degree of patriotism and place no obstacle in the way of the immediate mobilization of men.

We all agree that we must have men if we are to prosecute this war. They are necessary to man our battleships; they are essential on the firing line. Therefore, why not subserve our ideas regarding the methods required for such mobilization to those of the President and our military and naval experts.

They tell us that prompt action is necessary. They declare the volunteer system to be haphazard and unsafe. They have no criticism of the volunteer; in fact his unselfish devotion to his country and his willingness to die in defense of the flag would prevent criticism. But they tell us, and we all know, that quantity as well as quality is needed.

I am not one of those who assume that the majority of our young men, simply because they are slow in enlisting, are disloyal. I am not fastening upon them the stigma of "slacker."

Many entertain scruples, religious or otherwise, against war; others give way to parental objections; others hesitate at the thought of the possible grief that may come to their parents, brothers, and sisters by their enlistment.

These boys are doing their duty as they see it. We should not brand them as cowards. But if we refuse to order them to the colors and fail to say to them that they must set aside their scruples and respond to the Nation's call, we are officially classifying them as "slackers" and disloyal.

The responsibility of defending the flag of our country must not rest upon a few. It is a responsibility all must bear. And Congress should not say that all are not ready to do their duty.

I am not an advocate of an immense army of professional fighters—of men trained in the arts of slaughter—but I am a believer in the practicality of universal military training. I believe it will be a means for increasing the efficiency and the health and character of our young manhood, and I also believe it will serve as a guaranty for the safety of democracy.

As our President has ably pointed out, this is a time when every man, woman, and child should cheerfully bear his or her part of the burden. This is a nation's war; it is not the war of any one section or any one party. Therefore there is a universal liability. And it is unfair to those brave young men who rush to the recruiting station at the Nation's first call to say that they must bear the burden alone.

I have heard many of my colleagues voice their opposition to conscription. They contend it savors too much of autocracy. I have heard others denounce the selective-draft system as one open to abuse and which will pave the way for discrimination.

But, after giving these matters careful consideration, I have accepted the President's recommendation, because I feel it will not only be the means of conserving our commercial and industrial strength but will at the same time provide the necessary men for our naval and military forces.

We must not wreck our industrial, our commercial, or our agricultural forces, for these are as essential as the military and naval units. And in my estimation the only safeguard against such a calamity is the select draft.

Each individual should be called upon to render the service he can, some in one capacity and some in another. There is a duty for each citizen, either in the fighting ranks or with that vast army which will be needed at home to make our military and naval operations successful.

Then, too, there is another phase to be considered at this time: We must wipe out the bitter feeling that is prevalent in some sections between capital and labor, between the rich and the poor, between the native-born and the naturalized citizen.

We must instill into the hearts of those immigrants who have taken up residence in this country a lesson in loyalty to American institutions which was instilled into the hearts of our fathers by war and privation. They should be taught that they have responsibilities as well as privileges. And, in my opinion, this can only be done by compelling each and every citizen to do his or her duty, irrespective of place of birth, of position and wealth. For we are all Americans, and as such must stand united against the foe. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. DENT. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee [Mr. GARRETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for more than half a century our country has been at peace with itself and all the world, save a misunderstanding with the Spanish Government, which was of short duration.

Our people had come to be lovers of peace; friendship, fellowship, brotherhood, and good will dwelt among them and had become a controlling factor in their national life.

The bitterness, sectional hatred, and partisan strife growing out of the late War between the States had become a matter of history; the surviving veterans of that titanic struggle had long since met in joint reunion, shaken hands across the bloody chasm, and as brother men now sit in the evening of life calmly and peacefully beholding the setting sun casting his golden rays over a reunited people, with one hope, one country, and one flag. And, sirs, while our people thus reunited in domestic peace and tranquility, rejoicing in the hope and belief that our country would know war no more forever, there suddenly came, as it were, a thunderbolt out of a clear sky, and the war gods of the Orient were crying aloud and all America stood breathless, for the world seemed on fire. Millions of people were rushing to war in the Old World. Our people began immediately to ask themselves the question, Will our country be drawn into this awful catastrophe? Will this terrible war fire spread to our shores and consume our people?

Our Christian people offered up their prayers daily to the God of our fathers that our country might be saved from the vortex of this awful, cruel war. But the face of Jehu, ah seemed turned from them. How strange are Thy ways, O Lord! Yea; they are beyond our understanding.

President Wilson set himself about to save our country from this world-wide conflagration—to protect the rights of America and her people, at home and abroad, upon land and sea—and to maintain neutrality and peace before the world with honor. The President of the United States did all in his power to avert war with the Imperial German Government. He was exceedingly patient and long-suffering.

Finally when it became perfectly apparent that the German Government had determined upon a course which absolutely ignored all rights guaranteed to our people as a neutral country upon the high seas, and had offered to conspire with friendly nations to destroy our Government and dismember our Union,

the President came before Congress and delivered a message in which, concerning the conduct of the German Government toward the United States, he said:

Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle.

I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any Government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world. By painful stage after stage has that law been built up, with meager enough results, indeed, after all was accomplished that could be accomplished, but always with a clear view, at least, of what the heart and conscience of mankind demanded. This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapon which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants—men, women, and children—engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people can not be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

There is one choice we can not make, we are incapable of making; we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

Mr. Chairman, immediately upon receiving this message, a resolution was introduced in the Congress declaring that a state of war now exists between the United States and the Imperial Government of Germany.

I supported this resolution without hesitation or mental reservation. While I regretted to the very bottom of my soul that our country was forced into this war, it is now no longer a question of peace or war.

Our country had already been drawn into the war against its wish by reason of the outrages committed against its people by the German Government, as set forth in the President's message.

We must now either submit to these outrages or fight.

Our national honor demanded that we fight and fight we will. [Applause.]

And I want to say here and now, Mr. Chairman, that from the day I took the oath of office as a Member of the Sixty-third Congress until this hour, I have stood steadfastly by President Wilson without hesitation or halting; I have walked by his side all the way, holding up his hands at every turn of the road; I am standing by him just as steadfastly now.

I have voted on the floor of this House and in the committee to give the President all the money and men to carry on this war that has been asked for, but because I do not agree with every provision of an Army bill prepared in the Department of War should not and will not by my friends be construed as an act of infidelity, either to the President or my country.

The discussion on the floor of the House and in the press of the country attempts to place those who are advocating the committee report of this bill in the attitude of being against the President. To me that is a personal affront. If there is a man on the floor of this House, if there was a man in the House of the Sixty-third Congress, who stood more steadfastly day by day and week by week by President Wilson than myself I would like to hear his name called. I was one of the Members in 1914 who stayed on the floor of this House through that long summer, when my own political fortunes were in the balance at home, and I never deserted the President for one moment then, although it cost me my seat in this House. [Applause.]

I am receiving, as I guess many of you gentlemen are, telegrams from my home people. I received one something like this, as shown by a newspaper publication in my State:

Maj. George W. Littlefield, of this city, member of the American Defense Society of New York, has received a telegram from that organization in which it is alleged that D. E. GARRETT, of Houston, one of the two Congressmen at large from Texas, is not giving wholehearted support to the President in his war program, and requesting

that mass meetings be held in Texas to show Congressman GARRETT that Americans who sent him to Congress demand that he support universal military training and the President.

The society asked Maj. Littlefield to please wire of his willingness to fight for a united Nation now.

Maj. Littlefield wired assurance to the American Defense Society that he and representative citizens of Texas are standing behind the President in his war policy, and that Congressman GARRETT had been so advised.

The following telegram was sent to Congressman GARRETT:

You are reported as opposing the President's policy for raising an army. If true, you do not represent the great majority sentiment of the State, who are heartily with the President. We urge you to give his policy your open and actual support.

Now, mark that telegram. In the first place, it raises the question of universal military training, which is not before the House of Representatives, and has not been during this Congress. [Applause.]

The American Defense Society is trying to foist on the people the idea that I want to oppose the President, which is wholly untrue, and that I am opposed to a policy, military training, not now being considered by the House.

Here is a society in New York attempting to make people in my State believe that I am not standing by the President of the United States, and not true to my country, simply because I do not take without equivocation a bill from the War Department and agree to support it without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." I am more than anxious to receive instructions from my home people, and would welcome the personal opinion of Maj. Littlefield, but I must protest against the New York society bringing in question my loyalty to the President, my people, or my country.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, because of criticism appearing in some of the papers in my State, of my action in the Committee on Military Affairs in voting with the majority of the committee in reporting out this bill. It is well known to the committee that this bill does not fully reflect my views, but it was the best we could get under prevailing conditions in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, coming now to the provisions of the bill. There can be no difference of opinion among Americans that we should have, at the earliest practical moment, an efficient and effective Army to help crush that Government that would, if it could, destroy our own. But I am fully persuaded that there is ground for honest difference of opinion as to the method and manner of raising the men and money. This is a legislative duty devolving upon Congress and for which the Congress will be held responsible by the country, and, as one Member of Congress, I have tried to do my duty as I have been given wisdom. And I shall stand ready to be judged by my people for my action at this time. They may doubt my judgment, but I do not believe they will question my sincerity of purpose.

The bill as reported by a majority of the committee differs from the bill drawn by the War Department in two or three particulars only; all other parts of the bill are substantially the same.

The committee bill and that of the War Department authorizes the increase of the Regular Army and the raising of the National Guard to war strength, first by voluntary enlistment, and afterwards, if necessary, by draft.

There is no difference in the War Department bill and the committee bill in this respect. Both recognize and retain the volunteer system. When the Regular Army and National Guard have been recruited to full war strength, either by the voluntary system or draft, in the discretion of the President, then the War Department bill provides that the additional force of 500,000 men, and if, in the discretion of the President, a second call for 500,000 men be needed, that such force shall be raised and maintained by selective draft exclusively of all male citizens between the ages of 19 and 25.

The difference, in the main, between the majority of the Committee on Military Affairs and the War Department is upon this feature of the bill. We have not been able, after most careful and conscientious study of the question, to reach an agreement whereby we are willing to say that a great war like the one in which our country is now engaged, contending, as we are, against the greatest military nation on earth, shall be fought by the boys and young men of America between the ages of 19 and 25, while all other citizens capable of bearing arms shall be relieved of military service in such a crisis. I believe this to be a man's war, in which the men of the country between proper military ages should respond to the call to arms, based upon liability to military service, according to their ability to render. I am unwilling for the boys so young in years to be conscripted into the Army of the country while the loafers around pool halls and billiard rooms and the street-

corner gazers shall be exempted because they happen to be over 25 years old; as most of that crowd are.

Can it be said that a boy should be conscripted into the Army to fight for his country before his country has given him a voice in the management of its affairs, or before he is old enough to vote or to execute a will?

I desire, gentlemen, to call your attention to the following table, compiled by Mr. MORIN, of the Committee on Military Affairs, which is taken from the constitutions of the countries, showing the ages at which universal compulsory and voluntary services begin:

Norway, universal compulsory service begins at.....	23
Brazil, universal compulsory service begins at.....	21
Greece, universal compulsory service begins at.....	21
Chile, universal compulsory service begins at.....	21
Austria, universal compulsory service begins at.....	21
Hungary, universal compulsory service begins at.....	21
Roumania, universal compulsory service begins at.....	21
Serbia, universal compulsory service begins at.....	21
Sweden, universal and volunteer service begins at.....	21
Denmark, universal service begins at.....	21
Germany, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Turkey, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Bulgaria, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
France, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Russia, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Italy, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Japan, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Portugal, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Switzerland, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
Argentina, universal compulsory service begins at.....	20
England, volunteer.....	20
Belgium, volunteer and compulsory; 49 per cent conscription, no definite age.	

It will be observed that not one of these foreign countries force their boys into military service at the age of 19, the age proposed by the War Department for conscripting American boys.

The committee bill simply authorizes the President to issue a call for a volunteer army of 500,000 in the first instance, and an additional force of 500,000 if he deems it necessary; but does not attempt, in any manner to direct the President what action he shall take in the premises, whether he will or will not issue the call for volunteers is left entirely in his hands.

All the machinery for putting into effect, the draft system, as provided in the War Department's bill, is retained in the committee bill. Secretary of War Baker stated to our committee that it would take from three to four months to make registrations and to put the draft system into operation.

So that if the President should issue a call for volunteers immediately upon the passage of the act it would give all citizens of military age about four months in which to volunteer their services, should they desire to do so. And I do not see how there can be any reasonable objection to this. However, should the machinery for the draft system be put in operation sooner than anticipated by the Secretary of War, and in the event the President decides that such additional force or forces shall not have been effectually raised under the call for volunteers, the President is fully authorized to raise said force or forces by draft, the same as provided in the War Department bill. Except under the committee bill the draft, based upon liability to military service, applies to all male citizens, or male persons who have declared their intentions to become citizens, except alien enemies, between the ages of 21 and 40 years, both inclusive; and not between the ages of 19 and 25 years, as provided in the War Department bill; so that the main differences between the committee bill and War Department bill is:

First. During the time between the passage of the act and the completion of registration as provided under the draft system all persons of military age should be given an opportunity to volunteer, if they desire to do so, which, I believe, would greatly facilitate the raising of an adequate Army at once.

Second. The ages for military service under the draft system is changed from 19 and 25 to 21 and 40 years, inclusive.

The only other change of any consequence is: The committee bill provides that all forces other than the Regular Army shall be composed of men who come from and officers who are appointed from the same State and locality, as far as practicable; to the end that the soldier boys may be of whatever comfort they may to each other in dispelling that homesickness incident to Army life. The bill prepared by the War Department contained no such provision, which, for the social comfort and happiness of our soldiers, is very important and desirable.

The bill provides that all officers, whether in the National Guard or Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, which makes the bill absolutely void of all political entangle-

ments. The bill appropriates \$3,000,000,000 for the use of the Army, as recommended by the War Department.

That the voluntary system has been successful in our country in times past is a matter of history.

The committee bill in no way attempts to dictate to the President whether or not he will issue a call for volunteers or say whether or not this Army shall be raised by volunteer enlistment or whether he will put in force immediately upon the completion of the registration, the draft system. Can there be any possible complaint about that? You may read this bill from one end to the other, and you will find nowhere in it where there is one single obstacle thrown in the way of the President or the War Department to prevent them from raising an efficient Army and raising it now. But are we ready to depart from the volunteer system altogether? I was somewhat amused yesterday afternoon to observe in one of the newspapers that a British officer, now in this country on an important mission, had given out an interview wherein he criticized the volunteer system of England in this war and in which he refers to the fact that the volunteer system has given his country a great deal of trouble. That distinguished officer, however, did not say that in this great conflict England had called to her colors by voluntary enlistment more than 5,000,000 men and that there are less than 1,000,000 who have been raised by conscription.

Who is it to-day on the northern front of France that is battering down the breastworks and driving back inch by inch and foot by foot the indomitable army of the Kaiser? Who is it that is taking the big guns away from his men? Who is it that is capturing prisoners and driving the German Army back to their own soil? It is the brave, fearless volunteer soldiers of England and France. [Applause.] I wondered when that distinguished gentleman was speaking concerning the failure of the volunteer system in England if he could not recall that in this country at the time when Washington and Lafayette lived and moved among men, that this country had considerable to do with the volunteer system in this country. It was quite successful then and entirely satisfactory to the American people. Are we to abolish it now? Throw it aside like a worn-out garment and forget that it was through the volunteer army that our Republic was established, its Constitution written, and its life preserved until this very hour? If we are to abandon the volunteer system altogether at the beginning of this war, and men are not to be permitted to respond to the call of their country as volunteers, then I ask your most serious consideration of the question of whether or not the boys of America between the ages of 19 and 25 shall be made to fight this war against the most powerful military nation on this earth, while all men above the age of 25 shall be exempt? To my mind such a proposition is so unjust, unfair, undemocratic, and unpatriotic that it should receive the just condemnation of every Member of this House. As far as I am concerned, I want this war to be fought by the men of the country and not the schoolboys. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I would like to know for my personal information where the limit of 19 to 25 appears in the bill that is under consideration?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The limit of 19 to 25, I will answer the gentleman, appears in the bill sent down to our committee by the War Department, which has been recommended for passage in the Senate, and will be over here in a few days, and I want this House to be ready for it when it gets here.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It is not, then, in the bill that is before the House?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. It is not.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. As I understand it, that provides 21 to 40.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes; and I say, to the credit of the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, that I do not know a single one of them who is in favor of putting the limits 19 to 25 in this bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question for information. Does he know whether or not the minority members of the Committee on Military Affairs are proposing to offer what is known as the Chamberlain bill as a substitute for the majority committee bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I do not.

Mr. COX. I wish some one would discuss that question.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I could not give the gentleman that information.

My friends, this is a question that we must settle for ourselves; and do not forget this fact, that we are going some day

to be called to judgment for the way we cast our votes here upon this question. I am willing that the boys of the country, even down to the age of 18, as provided in our national-defense act, if they so desire, may volunteer; but I can not believe that this Congress, representing a Government of over 100,000,000 people, with more than 20,000,000 men of military age, will write upon the statutes of the country a law saying to the boys of the country of the ages of 19 and 20, "You have not reached such years of discretion and have not that judgment of mind that would entitle you to cast a ballot for the election of Members of Congress, but you possess ample ability to shoulder a rifle and go out to be shot down for your Government." [Applause.] No, gentlemen, I can not believe this Congress will ever do that. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is willing to have the boys shot down under the volunteer system?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I answer the gentleman unhesitatingly, no. Wars are sometimes thrust upon people without their making, just as this one has come upon us. We can not always choose whether we shall live or die when our country is invaded, for then it becomes the duty of every man capable of bearing arms to come to his country's defense.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think when this boy volunteers to fight for his country that he has the right to expect that every other boy of equal capacity and of equal age shall stand in line by him and protect his rights?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Unquestionably, but for the life of me I can not see how a man can reach the conclusion that a law, under the guise of universal service, that limits the age of those who shall do the fighting from 19 to 25 years is producing universal service.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Is there any proposal to do that by anybody in the House that the gentleman knows?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I am trying to prepare the House against that hour that doth soon appear. [Laughter.] I know it is coming, and I know that when it gets here the same reason will be given to push it through this House and adopt it that is now being given to abandon the time-honored principle of volunteering. [Applause.] I am only trying to warn you that when that hour does come that the House of Representatives may stand by and say, "You may abandon the volunteer system if you will, but you can not put over us a universal service of only 19 to 25 years." Not only that, my friends, but may I ask this, Why should not this volunteer system remain upon the statute books, to be used in the discretion of the President if it in no manner impedes or hinders the progress of raising an army at this time? I will say further to the gentlemen: If the President or the Secretary of War should come to the Congress and say that we need an army, we need it now, we can not raise it under this system in this emergency, and asked me if I was willing to set aside the volunteer system under those conditions, I would unhesitatingly say "Yes." But they have never done that. It will take four months, the Secretary of War said, before he can get his machinery in operation and be ready to enter upon the draft system. Is there any reason why, pending the time the War Department is making ready for the installation of the draft system, that the President could not issue a call for a million volunteers. My candid opinion is that if the President should issue such a call, they would never need a list of conscripts, because the men would be standing at the doors waiting. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I will.

Mr. GORDON. Is there any provision of law to-day by which any man can enlist in the Regular Army or the National Guard for a period of less than seven years—three in the active and four in the reserve?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I think not. I think the gentleman is correct, and that is the law, and that is one reason—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. In one moment. That is another reason why those people who want to be on the honor roll to fight our country's battles, but who do not wish to be in the Regular Army and who do not wish to be in the National Guard, but are willing to volunteer in this war, ought to, in my opinion, be given an opportunity to do so.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is true under existing law that permissions to enlist in the Regular Army are as stated; but is it not provided in this bill that the term of enlistments in these

organizations are for this emergency and shall be only for this emergency?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. This bill we are discussing has not become a law.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman is discussing his bill, and his bill is the bill which he expects us to pass.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Now, gentlemen, in conclusion, I would say this—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Missouri, the Speaker of this House [Mr. CLARK]. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I desire to announce before I begin that I do not want to be interrupted until I get through, and then I will answer any reasonable and pertinent question that any gentleman wants to ask. I know what I want to say and I want to say it in a connected way. Two things are true beyond the shadow of a doubt:

First. For a Member of the House or Senate to differ with the President of the Republic—any President—is not pleasant. On the contrary, it is painful, especially when the President is one whom you have helped elect. I have made it a rule to always support the President—any President—when I believe he is right, and on doubtful questions give him the benefit of the doubt. Further than that I will not go, so help me Almighty God! Further than that I can not go and make good the oath that I took when I was sworn into this House. Further than that I can not go and be true to the principles of representative government. [Applause.] The President of the United States is the most powerful personage in the wide, wide world—more powerful than the Kaiser, Emperor, or King, any other variety of potentate. It is because he is the head of 100,000,000 free people. [Applause.] That is the reason he is powerful. He has his functions to perform and, as far as I have been able to observe, he is not bashful about performing them. [Laughter.] The House and Senate have their functions to perform, and if we are men we will perform them. [Applause.]

When a Member of the House or Senate has thoroughly and conscientiously studied a question with open mind and with all the lights available and has formed a conclusion, he should vote that conclusion, even though it runs counter to the desire of the President. If he does not do that, he is unfit to sit in House or Senate. He should resolutely and courageously do that, be the consequences to him personally what they may. Believing these things, I am about to express my opinion on the pending bill in language as temperate, kindly, and courteous as possible—an opinion arrived at after much investigation and more thought. I regret exceedingly that I can not agree with the President and his advisers on everything in this bill. But this is still a free country, and free speech has not yet been prohibited in the House of Representatives. For many years I have served the people in various positions of trust, always with perfect fidelity and with whatever capacity God has blessed me. I shall continue to do so to the end, whether that be near or far.

Second. We have entered into a great war—upon a stupendous undertaking. That being the case, this House will vote every man and every dollar needed to press it to a speedy and successful conclusion. On that we are all agreed, and anybody anywhere who disputes that pregnant fact grossly misrepresents a large number of men in House and Senate who are honestly endeavoring to discharge their duties. The only thing about which we debate is how best to accomplish the desired end; how most efficaciously to serve our country and our kind. The principal difference betwixt the contending forces here is this: One side wants a conscription and conscription only; nothing else will satisfy them. The other desires to give patriotic men of military age a chance to demonstrate their courage and their patriotism by volunteering within a reasonable time before the conscription mill is started grinding. Why any man should be denounced by all the vile names found in the dictionaries and by some not admitted to any dictionary and heard only in the stews for supporting either one of the two propositions is utterly beyond my comprehension. Those in favor of giving the traditional volunteer system a chance have never abused or denounced those in favor of conscription. All the foul abuse and malicious slanders are directed against the men who advocate giving a fair, reasonable trial of the old volunteer system which gained us victory in all our wars. [Applause.] It is astounding, and it is a safe and cowardly performance at a distance—much safer than to attempt it at a space of 3 feet. [Applause.] I am unreservedly in favor of the volunteer amendment to the Army bill. [Applause.] Mr.

DENT and the majority of his committee deserve great credit for reporting it, notwithstanding the pressure and blandishments used to induce them not to do so. I do not in any way impeach the integrity or the patriotism of the minority who want conscription, notwithstanding they fly squarely in the face not only of our own history but of the history of all English-speaking peoples; but why should Chairman DENT and the majority of the Military Committee be assailed with inhuman rancor because they stand for the American doctrine of giving an opportunity for the brave, the patriotic, to volunteer to fight for their country?

Of all men, Missourians should be the foremost to defend the volunteer system, for Missouri is the only State in the Union to send more than her full quota—without a draft, mark you—into both the Union and Confederate Armies. [Applause.] That is a record to which there is no parallel in all history. In 1860 her total vote was only 165,518; yet she sent 111,000 volunteers into the Union Army and, as nearly as can be ascertained, 50,000 volunteers into the Confederate Army, a grand total of 161,000 volunteers [applause], and there can be no question that she will do her full share in this emergency if only given a chance. [Applause.]

Now, when some of these high conscriptionists undertake to give the records of their State let them give one that will approach that. For a chance for that imperial Commonwealth to have the glorious privilege of raising her full quota of her brave and gallant sons by the volunteer system instead of being dragged into the Army by the scruff of their necks, I humbly pray the American Congress. [Applause.] I protest with all my heart and mind and soul against having the slur of being a conscript placed upon the men of Missouri. In the estimation of Missourians there is precious little difference between a conscript and a convict. [Applause.] Missourians wish to serve shoulder to shoulder, elbow to elbow, heart to heart with their neighbors, friends, and kindred and do not desire to be broken up into small squads and distributed among strangers from distant localities. Wounded, their neighbors would render first aid. Sick, their friends would minister unto them. Dead, their friends and neighbors would bury them. Homesick and discouraged, their comrades would cheer them up. All history teaches that men fight better under such circumstances. There can not be any question about it. You can not produce any single great military name that will deny it. Some of these carpet knights may do so. [Laughter.] They want the folks back home to know that they discharged the duties of a soldier bravely, faithfully, and well, even unto death. Whatever else may be said of the Germans, nobody save an incorrigible and congenital idiot will deny that they fight well and know something about warfare. Pick up any newspaper, and what do you see? "The Bavarian Troops"; "The Saxon Troops"; "The Brandenburg Division"; "The Potsdam Guards"; "The Wurttemberg Infantry"; and so on through all the 26 States comprising the Empire and their subdivisions. Fighting thus, a pride of home is cultivated, thereby increasing their gallantry and their efficiency. So in the British Army troops have local designations such as "The Scotch Greys," which twice in their experience have been almost absolutely destroyed; "Princess Pat's Regiment," which has been nearly wiped out in Europe.

Why not have Missouri troops at least in companies, regiments, and brigades; Illinois troops; Kentucky troops; and so on through all the States?

It is asserted, however, that such arranging of units, such as I have suggested, into Missourians, Kentuckians, Kansans, Mississippians, and so forth, will be made. My friends, be not deceived by such talk. It is a tub to the whale—a sop to Cerberus, a blind for your eyes, a snare for your feet, a trap for the unwary—merely that, and nothing more. [Applause.] Why do I say that? Because the Senate is this very moment considering the War Department bill without the volunteer feature and without local units. The newspapers say that it will pass the Senate in the precise shape in which it was sent to the Senate by the War Department. What they hope is that we will turn down the majority of the House Committee on Military Affairs and swallow the War Department bill hook, line, and sinker. Failing to ram it down our throats in open fight here on the floor of the House, they hope to induce the conferees to give them what they want. If they have their way, there is no more chance for the organization of troops by State units than there is for us to be translated in chariots of fire after the manner of the prophet Elijah. [Applause.]

It is maliciously asserted that we who desire to give the volunteers a chance to serve their country are endeavoring to retard the creation of an army. That is simply preposterous, and if I did not want to keep within the bounds of parliamentary language I would make it a great deal stronger than that. [Ap-

plause.] On the contrary, the call for volunteers would hasten the formation of an army. It is understood that War Department officials say that it will require from three to five months to set the draft going. Why not then call for volunteers at once and secure a large volunteer army while preparing for the draft? [Applause.] Clearly it is those who oppose calling for volunteers and not those favoring the volunteers who are delaying the formation of an army.

Another thing, if the President had the day after the war was declared asked Congress to authorize him to call for 500,000 volunteers or even a million, both Houses would have passed the bill in 48 hours, and by this time he would have thousands of volunteers in camp and in training. [Loud applause.]

But it is said in answer to all this that anyone desiring to volunteer can enlist in the Standing Army! That is no answer at all, because it is a very different thing to serve as a volunteer with volunteers and to serve in the Standing Army. There is no use to give the reasons. [Applause.] They exist and intelligent people understand them full well.

Another serious objection to the War Department bill is the conscription age limit of 19 to 25. If we are to have conscription, it should apply to all men of military age. And if it did there would not be such a hullabaloo in certain quarters. When I went out to Chicago on St. Patrick's Day to make a speech to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick—I think that is the name of the society—a reporter came to the hotel to interview me about this war. I did not want to be interviewed; I was not in a talkative humor. I said, "I wish all the editors of this country who are shouting for war could be put into the front rank." [Applause.] I think that interview was never published. [Applause and laughter.]

Why single out boys who were too young to vote for President and Representatives? They had nothing to do with bringing on the war, and why should they not be of the exempted classes in this selective or seductive conscription, so they may finish their educations, thereby fitting themselves for the duties of citizenship? [Applause.]

Consistency is rated as a jewel. I have always thought that it is better to be right and inconsistent than to be consistent and wrong. However that may be, I beg leave to call to your attention the most delicious piece of inconsistency ever put into print since Gutenberg invented movable types.

All of us read the Washington Post, and it is a bright paper. All of us know that it is one of the staunchest advocates of conscription to be found betwixt the two seas. Homer sometimes nods, and surely the Post editor nodded when he wrote the leader in the issue of Sunday, April 22.

Here is an excerpt from it—all that is pertinent to this discussion:

THE ROOSEVELT VOLUNTEERS.

Officers in the War Department are said to be opposed to granting permission to Col. Theodore Roosevelt to raise a division of volunteers for early service in France, because they think it would be inconsistent with the plan for raising a regular army by selective draft.

If this objection were valid, Col. Roosevelt's patriotic offer should be declined.

But where is there any inconsistency? Where would the two plans conflict, and how?

Roosevelt is a fighting man. Nobody denies that. I think a great deal of him, because he knows a little about more things than any other human being I ever clapped my eyes on. [Laughter.] And he is not mealy-mouthed about telling it, either. [Laughter.]

Col. Roosevelt proposes to raise a division of volunteers, to be commanded by Regular Army officers. He proposes to accept men above the age of 25, who would not be subject to draft.

But they ought to put into parenthesis "Regular Army officers under him."

He proposes to accept men above the age of 25, who would not be subject to draft.

In that he is entirely correct.

The President's plan for selective draft would not be affected in the slightest degree by raising a division of volunteers.

If it will not be infringed upon in the slightest degree by raising one division of volunteers, how would it be infringed upon by raising a hundred times a thousand volunteers? [Applause.] Then he says:

The President's plan for selective draft would not be affected in the slightest degree by raising a division of volunteers.

That is what Prof. Squeers, of Dotheboy's Hall, would denominate "richness." I am reasonably certain that could Isaac Disraeli return to earth and get out a new and enlarged edition of his *Curiosities of Literature* he would give a prominent place to the foregoing excerpt from the Post. Col. Roosevelt is one of the most famous Americans, but is not giving him a division of volunteers a clear infringement of the se-

lective draft? Why should the honor of volunteer service be granted to him and denied to all other American citizens? There is no question about his fighting qualities; but there are others. [Applause.]

Now, there is another thing: Nor will the statement, oft repeated in the public press and in debate, that the volunteers will be less efficient than conscripts, because they will elect their own officers, and in many cases elect incompetent men, stand for an instant the light of truth. Under the present volunteer act the officers would be taken from the Officers' Reserve Corps, selected by the War Department after proper examination. In fact, a volunteer army would be officered in exactly the same way that the conscript army would be.

Another thing: These gentlemen insist that they would have to drill an army if you would have conscripts. Now, will some of them rise and state how it happens that they can drill conscripts, who do not want to go into war at all, any quicker than they can drill volunteers? What is the sense in that sort of twaddle? [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, I am going to read a few words from an old document. I am not certain but that I ought to apologize for reading it at all. Nevertheless I am going to read it. It is the Constitution of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] It is an instrument that Gladstone said was the greatest performance ever struck from the human mind at one time, an instrument at whose making George Washington presided. And by the way, he was simply a plain volunteer. [Applause.] He was not a Regular Army officer. He was not a conscript, bless your soul! [Applause.] And while I am at it, and while it has nothing in the world to do with this debate, I am going to give you briefly my opinion about him; and, that is, that we do not do him honor enough, even yet. [Applause.] In my judgment he rendered greater service to his country and to the cause of human liberty as the President of the Constitutional Convention than he did either as Commander in Chief of the Army or as President of the United States. [Applause.] If it had not been for his vast influence we never would have had any Constitution agreed upon, and if it had not been for the certainty that he would be the first President they never would have ratified it. [Applause.] They came mighty near not ratifying it anyhow.

I want to read to you from the Constitution. I still believe we are living under the Constitution. [Applause.] Here is what it says about armies; it is in the eighth section of Article I, where the powers of Congress are granted:

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.

To provide and maintain a navy.

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions.

That is prefatory. Then—

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

My fellow Representatives, has the Constitution of the United States also become "a mere scrap of paper"? [Applause.]

There was once a man in this country named Ulysses Simpson Grant, who had some vogue as a soldier. I take it that those who are howling for conscription and nothing but conscription would rather take the opinion of these modern carpet knights than that of the silent soldier. So far as I am concerned, I pin my faith in this matter to the invincible warrior. In his memoirs, by the way, one of the most readable books in our vernacular, he says:

While at Cairo I had frequent opportunities of meeting the rebel officers of the Columbus garrison. They seemed to be very fond of coming up on steamers under flags of truce. On two or three occasions I went down in like manner. When one of their boats was seen coming up carrying a white flag a gun would be fired from the lower battery at Fort Holt, throwing a shot across the bow as a signal to come no farther. I would then take a steamer and, with my staff and occasionally a few other officers, go down to receive the party. There were several officers among them whom I had known before, both at West Point and in Mexico. Seeing these officers, who had been educated for the profession of arms both at school and in actual war, which is a far more efficient training, impressed me with the great advantage the South possessed over the North at the beginning of the rebellion. They had from 30 to 40 per cent of the educated soldiers of the Nation.

They had no standing army, and consequently these trained soldiers had to find employment with the troops from their own States. In this way what there was of military education and training was distributed throughout their whole army. The whole loaf was leavened.

The North had a greater number of educated and trained soldiers, but the bulk of them were still in the Army and were retained generally with their old commands and rank until the war had lasted many months. In the Army of the Potomac there was what was known as the "regular brigade," in which, from the commanding officer down to the youngest second lieutenant, every one was educated to his profession. So, too, with many of the batteries; all of the officers, generally

four in number to each, were men educated for their profession. Some of these went into battle at the beginning under division commanders who were entirely without military training. This state of affairs gave me an idea, which I expressed while at Cairo: That the Government ought to disband the Regular Army, with the exception of the Staff Corps, and notify the disbanded officers that they would receive no compensation while the war lasted except as volunteers. The register should be kept up, but the names of all officers who were not in the volunteer service at the close should be stricken from it.

Now, gentlemen, I take it that the witness is competent, and that he is intelligent about the things he is talking about; and it strikes me that we had better pay some attention to such men as that, rather than to a lot of fellows that have never been under fire.

I want to read now an article that was published in the Baltimore Evening Sun. It is signed by a veteran. I read:

HARK, FROM THE TOMBS COME AN ARGUMENT AND A SONG ABOUT EQUAL IN QUALITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN.

Sir: Within the last six months a great deal has been said about regulars, volunteers, and drafted men. Nearly every old soldier of the Union Army knows that during the Civil War the volunteer regiments did more than nine-tenths of the fighting. In Fox's report of the 300 regiments that did nearly all the fighting, he has 296 volunteer regiments, four regiments of Regulars, and no drafted regiments.

They would not put them in the front. [Applause.] They were afraid to trust them. [Applause.] I read further:

Also, of the 46 regiments that lost between 200 and 300 killed in action, the whole 46 were volunteer regiments. Pennsylvania's share was 11, nearly one-fourth; and a New Hampshire regiment had the highest number (298) killed in action. No regiment reached 500 killed in action. The old song that I sang in war times—

"Our troops are the best the world ever saw;
Our men are the bravest that ever went to war;
Our people, they are good wherever you go;
Our boys, they are fast, and our girls, they are not slow."

Chorus: "Then hoist up the flag," etc.

VET.

BALTIMORE, April 17.

[Laughter and applause.]

One of the very best books ever written about the Civil War—I think Gen. Dick Taylor's *Destruction and Reconstruction* is the best—is a book entitled "Stonewall Jackson in the American Civil War," by Col. Henderson. I advise all of you who think well of the American volunteer to get it and read it. Here is what he said—and remember he was a colonel in the British Army:

Of the prowess of Lee's veterans sufficient has been said. Their deeds speak for themselves. But it was not the battle field alone that bore witness to their fortitude. German soldiers have told us that in the war of 1870, when their armies, marching on Paris, found, to their astonishment, the great city strongly garrisoned and hosts gathering in every quarter for its relief, a singular apathy took possession of the troops. The explanation offered by a great military writer is that "after a certain period even the victor becomes tired of war"; and "the more civilized, he adds, 'a people is, the more quickly will this weakness become apparent.'" Whether this explanation be adequate is not easy to decide. The fact remains, however, that the Confederate volunteer was able to overcome that longing for home which chilled the enthusiasm of the German conscript. And this is the more remarkable inasmuch as his career was not one of unchequered victory. In the spring of 1863 the Army of the Potomac, more numerous than ever, was still before him, firmly established on Virginian soil; hope of foreign intervention, despite the assurances of the politicians, was gradually fading, and it was but too evident that the war was far from over. Yet at no time during their two years of service had the soldiers shown the slightest sign of that discouragement which seized the Germans after two months. And who shall dare to say that the southerner was less highly civilized than the Prussian or the Bavarian. Political liberty, freedom of speech and action, are the real elements of civilization, and not merely education. But let the difference in the constitution of the two armies be borne in mind. The Confederates, with few exceptions, were volunteers—

[Applause.]—

who had become soldiers of their own choice, who had assumed arms deliberately and without compulsion, and who by their own votes were responsible that war had been declared. The Germans were conscripts, a dumb, powerless, irresponsible multitude, animated, no doubt, by hereditary hatred of the enemy but without that sense of moral obligation which exists in the volunteer. We may be permitted, then, to believe that this sense of moral obligation was one reason why the spirit of the southerners rose superior to human weakness, and that the old adage which declares that "one volunteer is better than three pressed men"—

[Applause.]

I wish you gentlemen would recollect who it is that is saying this—a trained soldier of the British Army, who observed the war with the eye of a military critic.

We may be permitted, then, to believe that this sense of moral obligation was one reason why the spirit of the southerners rose superior to human weakness, and that the old adage which declares that "one volunteer is better than three pressed men" is not yet out of date.

[Applause.]

I do not know whether Col. Henderson is dead or not. I hope he is not. If he is alive it will make his eyes pop open like morning-glories when he finds out what they are trying to do here. [Applause.]

Nor is it an unfair inference that the armies of the Confederacy, allied by the "crimson thread of kinship" to those of Wellington, of Raglan, and of Clyde, owed much of their enduring fortitude to "the rock whence they were hewn."

I stand on these quotations from Gen. Grant and Col. Henderson without any ceremony, and put them against every word that has been said in this country, high or low, in favor of conscription. [Applause.] And with those two witnesses only I might close the evidence on our side.

But I want to read to you another little piece. One of the greatest writers on army matters that ever lived in any country, and who has written a great many books, is Col. F. N. Maude, of the British Army. Whether he is the man who is the conqueror of Mesopotamia and the capturer of Bagdad I do not know, but he is a British colonel, at any rate. Here is just a short extract from him. After telling what the British have done he says:

What more in numbers could compulsion have afforded us; and what about the quality? After the distinction already won by many territorial units in the field—

You know what territorials are—

it is hardly necessary to say anything on this point, and as to the regulars, also volunteers, we will let the Prussian Guards and the German staff tell us now what they really think of our armies. Compulsion had done all that it could do, and more than even the best Prussian dared to expect, for their troops. It has carried them forward to almost certain death in a manner which has exacted the admiration of all our men and officers; but at that critical moment when the fate of empires hangs in the balance it has always failed them, and our men—territorials and regulars alike—

And he takes pains to say that the regulars are volunteers—territorials and regulars alike have sprung forward upon them with the bayonet with a determination never dreamt of in warfare since the days of Waterloo and the Peninsula.

Now, my friends, some gentlemen with more zeal than discretion have been trying to make out that everybody who is in favor of the volunteers is in some strange manner attacking the President of the United States and opposing him. We are not doing anything of the sort. We are supporting him better than they are, and I am going to prove it by him. [Applause.] He might not acknowledge it, but nevertheless it is true. This may be a little dry, but it is what Horace Greeley would have called "mighty rich reading."

In the months of January and February, 1916, there took place considerable correspondence between Secretary of War Lindley M. Garrison and President Wilson over certain measures proposed for preparation for national defense. Secretary Garrison indorsed and warmly advocated the continental army plan of the General Staff as opposed to the National Guard plan proposed by Mr. Hay, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

You all know Hay. He is one of the ablest men we have had in Congress in some years. [Applause.]

The Hay plan, Secretary Garrison declared in a letter to President Wilson bearing date of January 12, 1916, was the entire abandonment of the idea of a Federal force of national volunteers. He added:

There is unfortunately very little knowledge and very little intense personal interest in any Members of the House concerning military affairs.

It has always astonished me that men who know everything, who could pass a tariff bill over night, who can pass any other great measure while you wait, do not come down here and get into one House or the other of Congress. [Laughter.] About two years ago, when we had up the Federal reserve bank bill, one of these men came into my room and was telling me that we were all a lot of lunkheads in both the House and Senate, and he kept on in that way until I got somewhat warm. I said, "I have always wanted to know why men like you young Solomons, who know everything instantly, right off the bat, and do not have to investigate anything, do not get elected to Congress and come down here and do these things." He said, "Why, everybody does not want to come to Congress." I said, "There are not a thousand men in the United States who, if they could, would not come either to the House or the Senate." [Applause.] "And I will tell you the reason you do not come down here and get into the House or the Senate, because you can not get votes enough." [Laughter and applause.] "People have not confidence enough in you." I have not heard anything out of him since. [Laughter and applause.]

Secretary Garrison urged upon the President the imperative necessity of his seeking an occasion at the earliest possible moment to declare himself with respect to the matter, and in doing so to make it clear beyond peradventure that nothing excepting national forces, raised by the Nation and subject to its exclusive authority, responsibility, and control, is any real settlement of this issue.

To this letter the President replied on the 17th of January, 1916, following, in part, as follows:

I am not irrevocably or dogmatically committed to any one plan of providing the Nation with such a reserve, and am cordially willing to discuss alternative proposals.

On February 9, 1916, Secretary Garrison wrote the President that he desired to be informed of the determination reached by him with respect to the so-called Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill—to which he was also unalterably opposed—and to the continental army bill.

On February 10, 1916, the President wrote Secretary Garrison in part as follows:

As I have had occasion to say to you, I am not yet convinced that the measure of preparation for national defense which we deem necessary can be obtained through the instrumentality of the National Guard under Federal control and training, but I feel in duty bound to keep my mind open to conviction. The bill in which it will be embodied has not yet been drawn, as I learned to-day from Mr. HAY. I should deem it a very serious mistake to shut the door against this attempt on the part of the committee in perfect good faith to meet the essentials of the program set forth in my message, but in a way of their own choosing. As you know, I do not at all agree with you in favoring compulsory enlistment for training, and I fear the advocacy of compulsion before the committee of the House on the part of representatives of the Department of War has greatly prejudiced the House against the proposal for a continental army, little necessary connection as there is between the plan and the opinion of the Chief of Staff of compulsory enlistment.

Upon receipt of the above letter Secretary Garrison immediately tendered his resignation as Secretary of War, and it was promptly accepted by the President.

In the account of Secretary Garrison's resignation, published in the Washington Post of February 11, 1916, that paper stated that the President declined "to take any irrevocable stand on the ground that it would not be proper for him to say to a committee of Congress that it would have to take his plan or none. He declared he did not believe Members of the House dealing with military affairs were ignorant of the military necessities of the Nation, but had found them well informed."

Should a bill be presented to him which he could not accept as accomplishing the essential thing sought, he said, it would be his duty to veto it and go to the country on the merits.

Now, I say, we come nearer to backing up his well-considered opinion than Brother KAHN and his confreres. I want to read another sentence or two from the President. He is a great and good man. He writes with a great deal of facility. There has not been a more skillful artist hold of the English language in a century than he.

On Memorial Day, May 30, 1916, he made a speech at Arlington. In that speech he used these refreshing words:

I have heard a great many people talk about universal training. Universal voluntary training with all my heart, if you wish it, but America does not wish anything but compulsion of the spirit of America.

Those words were fitly spoken and are "like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

Now, I challenge Brother KAHN, who is the head and center of this thing. It reminds me of the knighting of an Englishman, "Kneel, Julius; rise up, Sir Julius." [Laughter and applause.]

I want to say in all seriousness that if this conscription fad is to be put on the American people there are two men in this House who deserve more credit for it than any other two men on top of the ground. One is the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the other is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. I am in favor of giving the devil his due. [Laughter and applause.]

For several years there has been a systematic effort in Congress, in certain clubs in this city, in many newspapers, by some public speakers, and in sundry magazines to belittle, depreciate, and minimize the American volunteer. I resent such performance in the name of the living and the dead, in the name of the brave men who gave us our freedom and who have maintained it, in the name of the volunteers who have shed imperishable luster upon American arms and upon the American Republic. Our Regulars have always done well, but there have been few of them by comparison. God knows that I have not the slightest disposition to disparage them; but after all due honor has been done to the Regulars, the fact remains that the volunteer has done most of our fighting.

The American volunteer is one of the glories of the Republic. Under young George Washington he saved the remnants of Braddock's army from destruction. In the French and Indian War he fought side by side with the British regulars. From April 19, 1775, when on the village green of Lexington and at the Concord Bridge the embattled farmers and the Minute Men of Massachusetts fired the shot heard around the world down to the last shot in the Spanish-American War, the American volunteer has been a very present help in every time of trouble. He made Bunker Hill a name to conjure with forever. He captured Burgoyne at Saratoga. He upheld Washington amid the horrors of Valley Forge; he destroyed the Hessians at Treu-

ton; he achieved the astounding victory at Kings Mountain against Ferguson's British-regulars, thereby turning the tide of the Revolutionary War. On a hundred fields, sometimes victorious, sometimes defeated, hungry, naked, footsore, and weary, he fought on with dogged pertinacity until he stood with the glorious and victorious Washington on the blood-stained heights of Yorktown, where Jefferson's declaration was made good and America was free indeed. [Applause.]

The critics of the American volunteer are always harping on the rout of a handful of untrained militia at Bladensburg by British regulars; why do they never, even by accident, mention Gen. Harrison's splendid men at the River Thames? How does it happen that they never can remember Andrew Jackson, and how at New Orleans, with 5,500 untrained backwoods volunteers armed with flint-lock, muzzle-loading rifles, he defeated Wellington's Peninsular army, who had snatched the iron crown of Charlemagne from the brow of Napoleon. That was the most amazing piece of shooting done by any army in any battle anywhere since the invention of gunpowder. And God be praised, American volunteers did it. [Applause.] But, strange to tell, these belittlers of the American volunteer are silent as the voiceless grave when it comes to Andrew Jackson and New Orleans! God forgive them for their lack of appreciation of the heroic deeds of the brave men who won imperishable renown on that bloody field!

The volunteer was our chief reliance in the War with Mexico. He conquered at Buena Vista, Churubusco, and Chapultepec, and placed the Starry Banner of the Republic on the palace of the Montezumas. In that war Col. Alexander Doniphan, with 1,100 green Missouri volunteers, marched from Fort Leavenworth, Kans., conquered Arizona, New Mexico, and Chihuahua, fighting dozens of battles, never losing even a skirmish, though frequently fighting ten times his own numbers, and finally reported to Gen. Taylor, ragged, hungry, but invincible, on the red field of Monterey—the most astounding march in the annals of war.

That is what a Missourian could do! The march of Xenophon and his 10,000 has been proclaimed by historians for 30 centuries, because he had sense enough to write a book giving an account of his own performances; but here is this brave Missourian, who made the most astounding march in the history of the human race, and Xenophon with his 10,000 is not a marker to it, and his glorious name does not appear in some of the great American encyclopedias. Why, if he had been a Massachusetts man, followed by Massachusetts volunteers, the world would hardly contain the books that would have been written about it. [Laughter.] I am a Missourian, thank God, and proud to be a countryman of Doniphan.

In the Civil War the volunteer did nine-tenths of the fighting on both sides. It is said that men will not volunteer; but nevertheless there was no draft until the North and the South had raised about 2,000,000 men—the best soldiers the sun has looked upon in 6,000 years of slaughter. At the first tap of the drum an entire people sprang to arms. We had, North and South, then only 33,000,000 people; now we have more than 100,000,000. Why doubt their love of country? Where is the man with sufficient temerity to stand up in a public place and assert that the volunteers who fought in the Civil War on both sides were not first-class soldiers? Who will dare to say that the men who charged with Pickett up the slippery slopes of Gettysburg or the men in blue who rallied around George H. Thomas, "The Rock of Chickamauga," for three dreadful days did not arise to the highest standard of military excellence? American volunteers, God bless them every one! [Applause.]

On Fame's eternal camping ground
Their silent tents are spread,
And Glory guards with solemn round
The bivouac of the dead!

If this stupendous war continues long, conscription may become necessary; but in the light of the history of English-speaking people we contend that it is not necessary now. Conscription has always been repugnant to men of our blood. [Applause.] In this very war Great Britain never ordered a conscription until she had raised 5,000,000 volunteers, a somewhat sizable army, certainly; and not one British conscript is fighting on the Continent now.

Canada, with only 7,000,000 population, 3,000,000 less than that of New York, has sent 400,000 volunteers across the sea. The Canadians have done such splendid deeds as to fill the world with their acclaim; and Canada has done her full share without a draft, and will have none of it. The Australians and New Zealanders have furnished their full quotas and acquitted themselves handsomely without a draft, and refused the draft on a referendum vote.

Why do gentlemen doubt the courage and the patriotism of the present generation of Americans? There is not a scintilla

of evidence that we have degenerated into a race of cowards or mollycoddles. As for myself, I love to think well of my countrymen.

Patrick Henry said:

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience.

The poet Campbell expanded Henry's thought into these lines:

Go watch the wheels of nature's mazy plan
And read the future from the past of man.

Assuming that the great lyric orator and the great Scotch poet were correct in formulating a rule for predicting human action, why do gentlemen jump to the conclusion that Americans of our time will fall in their full measure of duty and service in this time of stress? What right have they to assume any such preposterous condition of things? Our fathers did their duty; we will do ours, never fear.

For we are the same our fathers have been,
We see the same sights our fathers have seen;
We drink the same streams and view the same sun
And run the same course our fathers have run.

I am sure that the House will pardon a word purely personal. My only living son is, with my full consent, going into the Army in any capacity in which he can be useful, either as an officer or a private. [Applause.] Of course I hate to see him go, but he thinks it his duty, and I would not have it otherwise. Naturally he is dear to me—no dearer to me than other men's sons to them. I hope and pray that when the hour may come when he is subjected to the ordeal of fire, he may go into battle not by the side of the slackers and loafers whom the advocates of this bill say they desire to reach but shoulder to shoulder with free men who serve gladly, willingly, to fight for the honor, the safety, and the perpetuity of this Republic. Should he fall, I want the privilege of carving on his tombstone these words: "This man, a Missouri volunteer, died fighting for his country." [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize the disadvantage that any speaker must labor under who undertakes to follow the distinguished Speaker of the House, well beloved as he is by all of the membership of the House. However much anyone may differ with him, no man could have listened to the closing sentences of his very remarkable speech without having flee from his heart all sense of bitterness or personal antagonism which might have grown up because of a difference of view on this vital and all-absorbing question. And so I shall not in any way undertake to make my speech a reply to that of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] other than it may of necessity have to be, in reviewing the arguments that all have made on his side of the question and which he has so eloquently and well made. But I may be pardoned if I accept one challenge of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. He challenged any Member here who might say on behalf of the people of his State what he so proudly said touching Missouri and her conduct in the Civil War. Knowing the distinguished gentleman's birthplace, I marveled that he did not also remember that Kentucky, his native State, also furnished her full quota to both sides in that great conflict. And while he was speaking I received a telegram from a very distinguished Kentuckian, a constituent of mine, a soldier during the long, bitter years of the Civil War. In that telegram he makes a request of me with which I shall comply. It reads:

I have sent this letter to CHAMP CLARK. If he does not read it to the House, I hope you will.

Then follows the letter:

As an old and steadfast friend, whom you have sometimes honored by calling him your teacher, I am constrained to challenge the vote it is reported you are about to cast upon the Army bill. If the war should last long enough to put the issue to actual test, it will surely return to dog your political future and bar your usefulness in public life. Our beloved country never faced a more exigent situation. Congress will make mistakes at the peril of all we hold near and dear. The volunteer system, like the stagecoach, served its purpose in primitive times, but like that stagecoach it proved unequal to the expanding needs of modern times. The selective draft system is the contribution which experience offers to intelligence. The talk about Prussianizing our Army is the chatter of unreflected demagoguery. We must meet organism with organism and fight the enemy with both hands, not with one hand tied behind us. Out here in God's country the people understand the question perfectly. They know that the volunteer system favors the slacker and the shirk, while the selective draft system is fair to each and every man, but, above all, they know that the volunteer system has been a failure wherever tried, and seeking efficiency they prefer the selective draft system, just as seeking speed they would prefer a locomotive to an oxcart. I am distressed that you can not see your way to this view, but seem about to ally yourself with a policy of obstruction which can only embarrass us and aid the enemy. And it is in deep solicitude for our country and sincere affection for you that I venture to obtrude this protest.

HENRY WATTERSON.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, before I undertake somewhat briefly to state to the committee the fundamental principles that I think should guide us in determining this issue, let me say that it is not true, in my judgment, that those who favor the selective draft do or desire in any way to reflect upon the courage, the glory, or the patriotism of the volunteer soldier who of his own volition serves his country. [Applause.] That issue is not here presented, and no amount of oratory, no amount of review of the glorious pages in the history of America, of the things that we all love and have the right to recall with high pride can make that the issue. Believing, as I do, in the selective draft, and that it is absolutely essential for a consistent military policy at this time, I glory equally with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in the achievements of the volunteer soldier. [Applause.]

The indictment that is undertaken to be brought against the individual citizen is not by those who plead for the selective draft, but by those who undertake to make the country and this House believe that under a selective draft you are only going to get shirkers and slackers and that it is to be put upon a plane of comparison with the old conscription that came after men had failed and refused in any degree to volunteer and when those who were affected by it had the deserved stigma of unwillingness to defend their country. I deny that there can be any sort of stigma upon a man who by the law of his country is to be called upon to perform the highest act of citizenship—to offer his life for the support of that country.

When we undertake to make the selective draft we do not classify invidiously our citizens. We do not say that those to whom the draft shall apply are cowards, unworthy and unfit to be classed with volunteers. But we do say this, that modern war is the most scientific pursuit of man; that the needs of the Nation are not simply on the battle field, but behind the line in the feeding of the army in front and behind that among the workshops and in the activities and industries of a nation, and we do say that in order that a nation may use its strength most effectively there must be some coordination, there must be some decision as to who shall perform a particular duty that he owes to the country and who shall perform a duty of another character; we do say that this system that is required can not be maintained by depending upon a fluctuating coming in of an army of volunteers. Believing that, I believe that it is absolutely illogical that you should apply every possible scientific method the moment you get your men in the service, but that you should not apply such method in getting the raw material for it. So I deny again that the issue here is an issue between men who are discrediting the value of volunteers and those who extol them or that we are proposing that men shall fight our battles who are lacking in courage and who will fight only because they are compelled to do so. A draft is not humiliating except when applied after failure of volunteering and on slackers alone.

Now, I want to undertake very briefly to convey to the committee what I believe to be the task ahead of us and how best it can be met. It is natural that all of us, abhorring war, should in our hearts hope, and with some of us that hope may lead to belief, that this European war is soon to end, and yet no more fatal mistake could be made than for Congress to enter upon the task now in front of it with the belief that the war is soon to end. God grant that in His mercy it will very quickly end, that the tremendous sacrifice of life now going on may stop, but this Nation must prepare on the assumption of the very worst and not the very best conditions that may confront it. [Applause.] It must prepare not only to spend its treasure, but to spend its life. If the poet be right, that blood be the price of admiralty, aye, even more is blood the price of the honor and the sovereignty of a people; and the people of America would be unworthy of their heritage if they were prepared to enter this war only with money, seeking to hide behind the sons of the countries in alliance with us in this war who are giving their blood upon the battle fields of Europe. Whether men believed this war should have been entered into or not, every man now worthy of the name of American wants to see American soldiers equipped and sent to the battle fields of Europe as soon as we can send an efficient fighting force. [Applause.] I should be ashamed of my country to believe that we would wait one hour after we can supply an efficient fighting force. I use the word "efficient" because to send any other force there is not a help, but a hurt, to the common cause. The question then comes as to how best we can provide in the quickest way for an efficient fighting force and how we can best guarantee to keep that force efficient and to supply the places in the ranks of those who shall fall fighting for our country. Before I go into a discussion of the respective merits of the proposal of the minority and the ma-

jority of the committee it may not be amiss if I undertake to state what I conceive to be the obligation of both the Nation and of the citizen. A government must, as a primary factor, consider its own preservation. It must do those things necessary to win a war in the quickest possible manner, though it should so do them as to place the burden most equitably upon the citizenship of the country.

The citizen, on the other hand, owes as a duty to give in any degree of property, of comfort, aye, of life, when the Nation may ask. It is not volitional with him. That is the basic fact that should underlie this debate. The citizen has not a right to volunteer. He has not a right to refuse to serve. He has a duty to serve as and how and when his Nation commands [applause], and any other citizenship is a citizenship that lacks the very essence of what goes to make the sovereignty of a nation.

No amount of argument will ever convince me that a nation can last that does not have the right, and, when the occasion arises, exercises the right, to compel of every citizen the doing of those things that may be necessary for the preservation of the national life. [Applause.]

In a less momentous way that question was met at the beginning of this Government. When the States were organized together by the Articles of Confederation, and the National Government undertook to obtain those things necessary to continue its life, it had to leave it to the volition of the separate States. And they were told what moneys they should furnish and what acts they should perform in order that the Nation might continue and might thrive. And their failure to perform those acts forced those practical men, faced with a concrete situation, to create a Nation where the obligation of the citizen to the National Government was direct, not indirect; mandatory, and not volitional. And it was because of that that these United States came into being.

I repeat that a citizen has no right, moral or otherwise, to refuse to give of his life, if need be, when his Nation calls. Any man who is not willing to accept that position has no right to live within a country and accept the benefits that come from the Government that protects him. I am not nearly so much concerned in this hour touching the rights of individual citizens as I am touching the duties of the citizenship of America. [Applause.] What little experience I may have had in life has taught me that the man is best and worthiest who thinks most of his duty and insists least upon his rights. [Applause.]

Now, which is the fairest? This Nation must do the necessary thing. It must get the men; but which is the fairest way to get them? To get them simply from those who volunteer first and demand nothing from those who do not see the obligation as those who do volunteer? And, mark you, it does not follow that because a man does not volunteer he is a coward or that he is unwilling to do that which he ought to do for his country. Men have different conceptions of duty. Aye, men in this country and on this floor have all degrees of belief as to the particular thing they should do and the degree of the emergency which now confronts this country. It is not fair to ask of the citizen that he shall determine for himself whether his duty is to go to the front or whether his duty may not be to perform some of the essential things behind. It is not fair to ask him to decide that question, and it particularly is not fair to say to those who do solve it along the line of duty in volunteering that they shall bear the burden and that the Nation, as a nation, shall not take any action touching the duties of other men and their obligations who yet have not seen fit to volunteer.

The one cardinal principle that must be kept in mind in all of this debate is that we here are spokesmen for the Nation and not spokesmen for the individual. We are not spokesmen for our congressional districts or our States. I speak to-day not as a Kentuckian—proud though I am of the title—but as an American citizen in a National Congress of the United States. [Applause.] The need of the Nation is paramount, and not the wish of the individual. These statements, to my mind, should be axiomatic. I can not conceive of any man seriously disputing them, and in their last analysis no man on either side of this question is disputing them, because the report of the majority of the committee contemplates the right, when the need may come, of the Government to draft men into the service and recognizes the obligation of citizens to obey.

What, then, will justify a departure from the principle that I have laid down of the Nation, as a nation, determining the duty of its citizenship? Nothing but the efficiency that may be gained by a contrary system, and the only valid argument that is offered by those who favor the volunteer system is that you will get a more efficient force quicker. I deny it. I deny that you will get it as quick, and I deny that it will be more effi-

cient. Because, I repeat, under a selective draft, put in operation in the beginning, you are not choosing slackers and cowards; you are choosing from the mass of the citizenship of America according to their ability best to perform the function they are called upon to perform. And I, as an American, am unwilling to believe that the men who will come under the selective draft will come as cowards; or, to use the expression of the gentleman from Missouri, that the convict is equal to the conscript. I deny and repudiate any such suggestion. [Applause.]

It is said, however, that the selective draft can not be put in operation for many months, and that pending that you can obtain a volunteer force and that this volunteer force can be trained and officered and be made ready to take the field while you are getting ready to make your draft and make your enumeration. I deny it. I deny that there is anything in the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs, every word of which I have read, that warrants that conclusion. Oh, but the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]—I think it was—said, "Why, you in a measure confess it, because you provide for volunteering as to the Regular Army and the National Guard." I want to impress upon this House that the volunteering that is thus permitted, and which, by the way, gives an opportunity for those men who feel that their honor would be impaired if they obeyed the command of their country by reason of the law of their country, but that it will be kept bright if they volunteer, irrespective of a law, is justified by the existence of organizations in the Regular Army and National Guard already drafted that can absorb such volunteers, and—

Mr. MASON. May I ask a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MASON. Is there anything under the present law that would permit a man to volunteer during this war?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. And there is nothing under the present law that will carry out your plan. But if this bill passes, either according to the majority or the minority report, there will be an opportunity for men to enlist in the Regular Army and in the National Guard for the length of the war, and no longer. And every man here knows it, and nothing is more unfair than to try to produce the impression that there would be no opportunity for volunteers for the length of the war.

Mr. MASON. There is nothing there either, if you will pardon me, that justifies the impression that men ought to enlist now, when there is no call for enlistment and no opportunity to enlist during the war.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, the gentleman seems to be worried about there having been no call. I wonder at that man who thinks that the only kind of patriotic action is that which springs spontaneous and then talks about the need of a call in advance of volunteering. [Applause.]

When this law shall have passed, whether the view of the majority or that of the minority goes into effect, there will be an opportunity for enlistments. Gentlemen, if you will take the Record of to-day and turn to page 1023 you will find there a letter of the Secretary of War addressed to the Hon. JAMES H. BRADY, United States Senate, in which it is shown that there will be, according to the view of the Secretary of War, an opportunity for 724,718 volunteers.

Now, for my part I want to be frank with the House. I do not believe that any such number as that will be taken into the National Guard or into the Regular Army by volunteer methods. I question very much the desirability of doing it. But certainly there is an opportunity for two or three hundred thousand men to volunteer in these organizations.

Now I return to the pertinent inquiry: Why is it that the department says in one breath, according to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] and others, "We are not ready for volunteers, and we do not want volunteers now," and in the next breath points out a method for volunteering, running up into the thousands? To the casual observer there would be an inconsistency in that proposal; and yet there is nothing of the kind. I was stating when interrupted that the reason why volunteers can be taken into the Regular Army and into the National Guard now and mustered into the service is because the organizations are there, sufficient to absorb these men, and it is not necessary to go through the preliminary work of the organization and training of the officers that would be necessary if you were going to take men in under the volunteer system that is proposed by the majority of the committee. [Applause.] That fact is a dominant and pertinent fact, and it can not be lost sight of by any amount of oratory.

Oh, gentlemen say, "We will have an army quicker by virtue of the volunteer system"; and the gentleman from Kansas announced, with all the weight that attaches to membership on the Committee on Military Affairs, that one firm in America

could furnish a million rifles in 60 days after the order was given for equipping these men. It is only charitable to hope that his other statements touching facts are more nearly accurate than that statement [applause], because in less than 20 minutes after the statement was made by the gentleman from Kansas, Gen. Crozier said to me before my committee that they hoped, after the order was given, within 60 days to get some deliveries, and at the end of 12 months they trusted to be able to get a million rifles.

But more than rifles are needed for soldiers. There are camps, there is shelter, there is food, there is clothing, there is all of sanitation. God forbid that this country should ever again go through the experience that it went through with volunteer forces in the Spanish-American War, called into groups and assembled in camps without any provision having been made for them, so that the death rate from disease was infinitely greater than any death rate from wounds received in battle; so that the camp was more deadly to the soldier than the battle front itself.

Gentlemen, to organize a modern army is not a matter of a few moments. It is not a matter of a few days. Men who have sat, as I have sat for 10 days past, and listened to the details of the estimates that go to make up the \$3,000,000,000 that the Army is asking for would realize something of the tremendous task that is put upon the Army officers and the War Department in handling properly this force when it is called into existence.

Now, what is the proposal? The proposal is this, that these men shall be selected as the result of an enumeration of the citizenship of the land, which shall determine the numbers that are eligible, that they shall be selected and called for in such numbers and at such times as they can be properly taken care of and officered.

What is really the proposal that underlies the proposition of the majority of the committee? It crops out every now and then in the remarks of gentlemen. It came out to those who were observant in the speech of the distinguished Speaker of the House. It is this, that you can not and should not get volunteers except by getting them in units, when their organizations will be made up by them at the time; in other words, that individuals in my community and in your community shall be permitted to organize companies, and the companies shall be permitted to organize into regiments, and that these shall then be offered to the United States.

Oh, but some gentlemen will say the bill that is before the House provides that the President shall have the determination of the officers and may remove any that are incompetent. Gentlemen, there is a great deal of difference between what the law permits and what the facts will permit. If these men should be able, under their plan, as they say, overnight almost, to raise 500,000 men and to throw them into the Army of the United States, it would be absolutely necessary to take the officers that come with them, good, bad, or indifferent, because it would be better than any other available organization. But if you go along as it is proposed, by the training of officers, by making provision for the care and housing of these men, by the time your draft will have been made you will be prepared to receive your men as they come in, and these men will come in not according to chance but according to need. I repeat, the men will come in not as the result of chance but as the result of need. [Applause.] And it is entirely feasible and contemplated that when so taken in they shall be formed into regiments composed of men from the same State and, in large measure, locality.

Who is here so wise, so eminent, that he can tell how many men will volunteer, and from where. And who is here so courageous that he dare risk the safety of his country on the correctness of his guess. [Applause.]

The one essential thing for the proper organization of an army is continuity in the supply of men, and after that army is organized and it goes to the front, in order to support it with the reserves that are necessary to fill up the ranks, there must be knowledge of the number of men needed and the ability always to get that number. And when you leave it to the volition of men, you leave it to chance, say what you please.

If many men should volunteer in new units at once, we could not take care of them.

If we could not get them easily, we would have the disgrace of a campaign of recruiting such as England witnessed. If in the meanwhile we should be able to get organizations of officers, we would lack the men to fill the ranks. We could not know how many we would get from time to time, and could not make real provision for them. Of necessity we would have either organizations of officers without men, or men without effective organizations to feed them into.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman think that the majority report leaves that entirely to the volition of men? Does not the gentleman realize that we authorize the President to proceed with his program?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I appreciate the fact that the gentleman's bill is really built on a repudiation of the principle for which he contends. [Applause.] But the principle of volunteering, for which the gentleman has contended, is a principle that leaves to the volition of men and not to any system, the acquiring of the units.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman has stated that I built this on a repudiation of my own ideas. I think I ought to be permitted to make this statement, that the idea of the majority of the committee was that while the machinery was being put in operation for the draft system, the President, if necessary, could call for volunteers, to fill up the ranks by volunteers; and if Congress adjourns before that happens, then he will have the authority. And we did that in order to meet the argument that you could not raise them by volunteers.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman's plan contemplates getting the first 500,000 and then the second 500,000 by volunteers. Is not that true?

Mr. DENT. That is very true, if the President so decides.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Now, if the President so decides, when does he get the power to decide otherwise? When in his opinion the volunteering system breaks down. Is not that true?

Mr. DENT. That, in his opinion, the volunteer system has broken down.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENT. The President has the right to decide that it has broken down.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Now, I repeat that your proposal, as a whole, is built on the assumption that the volunteer system will break down. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am perfectly willing to concede that may not have been the motive and the desire of the gentleman, and I know he will appreciate that I speak in sincerity when I say to him that I attribute only the loftiest motives to him.

Mr. DENT. I am sure of that.

Mr. SHERLEY. But this House is not concerned with what was the intention of men. It is concerned with the legislative effect of their proposal. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. The gentleman certainly will not state that if the majority report is adopted the President can not get everything that he asks for.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, no; but I think he has to get it after he has gone through the trial and the tribulation of finding the volunteer system inadequate, and he gets it by having to try a system that if it fails you then put upon men the very stigma that you gentlemen say you are desirous of keeping away from the citizenship. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman—

Mr. SHERLEY. All right, sir.

Mr. DENT. But I want to ask the gentleman to state right in that connection if he believes we should use the selective draft in order to defend the country, why is it that the Navy, which is the first line of defense, is not selected in the same way? [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman's inquiry. It is one thing to be able to furnish 100,000 men over a course of years, as ships come into commission, and to get them by the volunteer system, and it is quite another thing to organize 1,000,000 men by the volunteer system, with the uncertainties of enlistment and of volunteering. [Applause.] If the gentleman can not see any difference in practical effect between keeping the Navy fully manned from year to year as ships come into commission by volunteers from 110,000,000 people, and requiring in all something like 100,000 men to man the ships—if the gentleman can not see the practical distinction between that problem and the one which presents itself of suddenly getting 1,000,000 men to put in the field, why then he and I can not meet anywhere along the line. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. "The gentleman" can see the difficulty in the problem; but what I want to understand is why it is that you should recognize the volunteer system when you come to fill up your enlisted men in the Navy, which confessedly is not filled up now, and yet repudiate the volunteer system when you come to the Army?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FARR. Eighty-seven thousand men for the Navy.

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a minute; one at a time. I am not undertaking to belittle the volunteer. I started my speech by a repudiation of that suggestion. My refusal to accept the volunteer system is not because I hold a grudge against the volunteer. God forbid that anything I should say should detract from the heroism and the patriotism of men who, wisely or unwisely, offer their lives at their country's call without waiting for law. [Applause.] But it is one thing to glory in the patriotism of men and it is another thing to adopt a system when there is imperative need of having the system work. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Why does the gentleman object to our offering to the President the opportunity to raise 500,000 men by volunteers—

Mr. SHERLEY. I have been rather stupid if I have not made plain to the gentleman and the House the reason why I object. The reasons why I object are these—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I did not finish my question. The bill from the War Department puts it up to the President that he shall be required to decide when the Regular Army and the National Guard is not being filled up rapidly enough, and we take exactly the same language which the bill uses to apply—

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the gentleman. The trouble with the gentleman is that he thinks that because he uses the same terms and applies them to different conditions he is consistent. Consistency consists not only in applying the same program, but in applying it when the facts upon which it is to be applied are the same. Now, I answer the gentleman in this way: The reason why it is practicable to accept volunteers in the Regular Army and the National Guard—

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a moment, to finish in my time the thought which I am trying to express. It is that in the National Guard and the Regular Army you have the organization that can absorb those men.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I yield all that.

Mr. SHERLEY. Whereas I deny that you could take care of half a million volunteers now if they were offered, in separate units.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But I understood the gentleman to say that we confessed our plan was a failure because we offered the alternative of the selective draft in the first two—

Mr. SHERLEY. If we can expedite this debate, I am perfectly willing to withdraw the statement that you all think it is a failure. I think it bears that construction, but I am willing to relieve you from that.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What the gentleman says about the organization of the National Guard and the Regular Army is also true of the Navy, is it not?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That the organization is there, and the question of volunteer officers is not involved.

Mr. SHERLEY. There have been many reasons advanced by many men for their position. You hear privately more than you hear publicly the statement that if you have a draft you will have riots in America. You usually hear that statement from men who did not believe that this country ought to go into war. [Applause.] I believe with my whole soul that this is a holy war that these United States are going to prosecute. [Applause.] I believe with every fiber of my being that every ounce of power that we have must be used in bringing the war to a victorious end. If we have riots, we shall know how to deal with them, but I deny there is any probability of riots. If they should come, we shall be able to separate the sheep from the goats.

I have little patience with men—I ought not to say that, because it is not the time when we should speak disparagingly of the motives of other men—but I am sure that those of us who feel the responsibility of having placed this country in a war are determined that by no failure of ours anywhere shall we make the success at all doubtful. [Applause.] Men have talked about it being difficult to vote against war. Each man must search his own conscience. It had been infinitely easier for me to vote "no" on the war resolution than to vote "aye." It is not a pleasant thing to send men into battle when you yourself shall not go. Nothing but a compelling sense of duty, I am sure, actuated those of us who on that fateful day voted "aye." It is a compelling sense of duty now that causes me to insist and to urge that this House do not adopt the system;

that they do not risk the lives of the men of America on a system that, however sincere their belief, has not the approval of those who have the duty to supervise, to train, and to lead this Army into battle.

I know it is the custom of the cloakroom, particularly in piping times of peace, to belittle the Regular Army officer and say that his viewpoint is the result of a selfish desire of promotion. If we send the Army into the trenches of France, the promotion that most of the officers of that first division will get will not be an earthly promotion. [Applause.] They present to you their views because upon them is the responsibility of getting results.

Let things go wrong in this country—we are an impatient people—and then these men will be held responsible. They tell you now, with a knowledge of what is needed, that it is not practicable to take over night 300,000 or 500,000 volunteers in new organizations and equip and train them. They tell you that the most important thing is to be sure of an adequate supply of men. They tell you, and England tells you, that the result of the volunteer system there was that at first they got more men than they could use, equip, and handle, and subsequently they got less, and finally they were forced to a draft. Men talk about their raising 5,000,000 men by the volunteer system. The last 2,000,000 or more of that 5,000,000 was raised by the most compulsory, odious method known to mankind. It was not the compulsion of the nation speaking as a nation; it was the compulsion of public opinion, public opinion that operated justly and unjustly upon the individual until it got so that no man fit to bear arms, no matter what the reason was, no matter how badly he should be needed at home, could stay at home because of what was said to him and of him by those in England.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is it, then, correct to say that those men who will be put in by compulsory law are fitted to fight alongside of the volunteers?

Mr. SHERLEY. I said that every man fitted to bear arms was under such criticism and attack that he sought to enlist whether he ought to have enlisted or not. As a result many who did enlist were sent home afterwards because they could serve their country better there than in the ranks. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Then, they were sent home under the volunteer system. Could not they be sent home under this bill by the Executive?

Mr. SHERLEY. The important fact is not that they were sent home under the volunteer system, but they were sent home; and there was that much loss of motion, that much weakness to the nation, that much of delay in preparing to meet the issue that faced England. That is the thing we want to avoid. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. This bill provides the same method of leaving men at home under the volunteer system as the draft system. Where is the difference?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is a great deal of difference in practice. It is one of those cases where you have a paper similarity but an actual dissimilarity. You can not take men as volunteers, raise a unit, get a hundred men to go into a company because John Smith is going to officer it, and then have 11 other companies of similar organization, and the 12 formed into a regiment, have them then offer to come into the service, and then undertake to use the selective plan of rejection, for your volunteer system will go to pieces. The very argument you gentlemen have made in favor of the volunteer system is that these men will volunteer if permitted to do it in their way, but they will not volunteer for the Regulars or the National Guard because it is not their way. The moment you put in the right to reject for reasons stated in the bill, then their way of volunteering disappears and their voluntary act itself disappears. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would suggest to him, in addition to the other matters he enumerated with regard to the volunteer who was sent home, the expense, the enormous expense, the waste of money, in training the man for the battle field and then sending him back to work in the industries.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is quite right. What has happened in Canada? We hear Canada talked of as being an example of the value of the volunteer system. Millions of money have been expended because of skeleton organizations that have to be maintained without the men in them, because the supply was not certain and shifted from day to day. Let us look at another aspect. Last summer I talked with a gentleman high in Canadian public affairs, who the day before had

received the news of the death of his boy at the front, and he told me something of the Canadian situation. He said to me, "Mr. SHERLEY, from the Province of Quebec hardly 10,000 men have gone to the front." He was not referring to the city of Quebec, but to the Province of Quebec.

Mr. KAHN. And the city of Montreal, a great city, is in that Province.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; but irrespective of that, the statement was made that but a little over 10,000 men at that time had volunteered from the Province of Quebec.

Mr. MASON. And as I understand it, they had no draft there?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; they did not. The gentleman seems to think it is commendable that one part of Canada should let the rest of it bear the burden of Canada. [Applause and laughter.]

To continue, Mr. Chairman, this gentleman with whom I was speaking said to me, "I do not mind my boy having gone to the front; I felt when he left that I should never see him again, and I would not have had him do otherwise than go; but I do feel that some of these other men with sons similarly situated should have their sons bear part of the burden." [Applause.] That is a natural feeling.

I do not know that I can add much to what I have already said. I have spoken very much longer than I anticipated, but may I make just a reference or two to some of the things that were said by the distinguished Speaker of the House? He quoted a number of distinguished soldiers. He quoted Col. Henderson, an officer of the English Army, who wrote a life of Stonewall Jackson, and a very great book it is, a book that I have taken great pleasure in reading. He commended it to us. May I be pardoned the liberty if I commend to him a book to read? I commend to him and to every man here present who has not read it Upton's Military Policy of the United States, and I will ask you not to take the conclusions of the author, but to examine the references that he gives for every statement that he makes and then see—not that the volunteer was not a brave soldier, not that the volunteer would not and did not fight, not that we have not won our wars under the volunteer system—but see the wastefulness of it and see the prolongation of war because of it, and how the inability and the unwillingness of men to throw their minds into the future and prepare and plan along scientific lines has resulted in unnecessary loss of life, in the calling of unnecessary numbers to the colors, and in great loss of time, of money, and of all the things that are desirable in the prosecution and successful termination of a war.

I also believe that the way to judge the future of man is by his past history, and I was struck somewhat by what the gentleman said touching the letters that had passed between Mr. Garrison, when Secretary of War, and the President of the United States. And as he read those letters I could not help but think that the President of the United States has learned by the events that have happened since then, whereas the Speaker of the House refuses to consider those things. I am glad that in the very letter of the President he said he had an open mind. I would to God that all men might keep an open mind and let the events as they have unfolded from day to day and week to week and month to month control their judgments. [Applause.] That was before most of the Mexican border trouble. The President said he was willing to try out the National Guard system, that he was not wedded to it, and he properly rebuked the then Secretary of War for his aspersions upon Members of Congress, and I share in what the distinguished Speaker of the House said touching the tendency of men to criticize Members of this body upon the assumption that they themselves alone know the facts. But it so happens that events in America have proven that the system that we adopted and that we put through by what is known as the Hay law is by no means the ideal system, to speak charitably of it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman think that the National Guard system, as patterned by the Hay bill, is a failure?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think it is a glittering success.

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman think it is a failure?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think it is a complete failure. I do not think any system that gets men into the service is a complete failure; but I am concerned not in what are complete failures but in the relative merit of things, and I hope to get hold of a plan that we will not have to describe in terms of failure, whether complete or partial. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. DENT. The gentleman thinks that the Hay bill is not a success on account of the experience upon the Mexican border?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes. I do not think that all that was due to the National Guard. I think some of it was due to red

tape in the War Department, and much was due to the fact that you had two systems that are not fundamentally reconcilable, and undertook to reconcile them, and that they did not work.

Mr. DENT. One further question, in order that we may get the facts correctly. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the first call of the militia issued by the President for the Mexican border was issued prior to the adoption of the Hay law?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is also aware of the fact that the Hay bill did not pass until June 3, 1916, and the last call of the President for the militia was issued June 18, so the Hay bill could not have been in operation very long.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am willing to concede the Hay bill did not get a complete or fair try out, yet it was not sufficiently different in fundamentals from the old National Guard system that they undertook to supersede to make any doubt in my mind as to its ultimate failure. By that I do not mean to say that it did not have value; but I am answering a contention of the Speaker of the House that because the President at that time did not agree with Mr. Garrison, then Secretary of War, we must now agree with the Speaker. I submit to those who are logicians that it is a non sequitur—it does not follow.

Just another word, gentlemen. Much has been said about our proposing that the boys shall do the fighting. Now, it might be a sufficient answer to that statement to say that the bill now before the House provides for a draft of men between the ages of 21 and 40, but men insist that this House will of necessity accept the terms of the Senate bill, and the Speaker, who generally is sure of the courage of the House and of its ability to hold its own, now warns you, gentlemen, that the House will lie down at the bidding of the Senate and accept whatever terms they put in the bill. I submit that this House can not in advance legislate on the theory that what it does it will give up simply because the Senate does something else. [Applause.] The statement was made by the gentleman that he would like to see the editors in the front ranks of the war. I do not want to see any class, because of its being that class, in the front ranks of the war. I should not vote for a particular age because it was a particular age. If men are to be chosen because of a given age, it is not because you want to make that age bear the burden, but it is because the efficiency of men of that age makes its requisite that they make the first sacrifice and that the Nation as a whole can better afford to put those men in that activity in war time than in some other. I repeat again the most dangerous thought men can have in the consideration of this subject is that of the individual. You have got to think of the Nation, and, hard though it may be, the individual can not count as an individual in face of the need and the necessity of the Nation. [Applause.] If we put through the selective draft younger men will go first, not because older men are unwilling to fight, not because older men would want to shunt off their responsibilities. That has not been the history of the world. When you have your volunteer system the married men usually volunteer more than do the unmarried ones. It is not the youngest men in society who furnish the more numerous volunteers.

The reason of the need of young men is because war now involves something more than it did in the old days. Men must get into their minds the fact that you have got absolutely to organize and mobilize the forces of the country. We talk a lot of this, but we do not seem to understand the very words that fall from our lips. War is not now simply a matter of men, but even more of metal. Statements have been made touching the men from my State who fought in the Battle of the Thames and those from my State and others who fought in the Battle of New Orleans; that they were volunteers who picked up their rifles and went to the front. It is true, and all glory to them and their bravery; but does any gentleman believe now, in cold, common-sense deliberation, that the need and conditions of men of that day, touching their ability to fight and win battles, has any relationship to the need and conditions of men to-day in fighting battles? If he does, why, then it is useless to point out to him the events that have been happening from hour to hour and from day to day. The mind of man has never been engaged in so scientific, coordinated an activity as it is now being engaged in on the battle fields of Europe.

Gentlemen, I can only end this rather desultory speech—because I have had no time for written preparation—as I began it by saying that the duty of the citizen is to give at the command of the Nation all that may be asked of him. His duty is to serve or not to serve as a soldier or as a civilian. The highest patriotism does not always exist in going to the front. Sometimes it is shown by a man playing a more humble rôle at home, even though some men may, with a sneer, say that it is a less hazardous rôle; but for a nation it is important that all men should be ready to give as the Nation determines, and it is ab-

solutely essential, if we are to be prepared for what may happen, that we should first determine not the need for the next few weeks or the next six months but, if need be, for the next three or five years, and that our plans should be founded upon command and not upon volition, with the uncertainties of it. God grant that we may have the wisdom and the patriotism to rise to the needs of this hour and see to it that through no shirking of ours, disagreeable as the task may be, do we fail to give to the President and to those who are to carry into the field the colors of America the army and the means which makes it efficient that will bring this war to a short and a glorious end. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER].

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think there is one thing we should make very clear and, if possible, hold it in mind from now until the end of this discussion, and that is that the men who are insisting upon the selective system have nothing but reverence and praise for the volunteer, past or present [applause], but that we do object to the system of butchery which destroys the volunteer when he gets in. We are talking about systems and not about patriotism.

The man who has read the story of any war that has been fought by volunteers in his heart bleeds because of the useless death of thousands of those men who came in under that haphazard system, managed by men who were strong of heart but not trained in military affairs, and certainly he does not wish to see the men of America started into this great war under such a system. We are discussing systems and not degrees of patriotism. There is another thing that we had just as well get clearly in our minds. If the volunteer system is right, the men who are for it ought to be willing to bank on it to the end of the war. If we ever intend to use the selective system, it is only fair that we begin with it. [Applause.]

You can never start a volunteer system and switch to the other without bringing about the very condition that you have condemned here for three days. I believe that we should take the men from 21 to 50, so far as I am concerned, and I am not in favor of selecting boys under age. [Applause.] But remember this, that I have a boy who has just turned 16. He is my only boy. He is already in uniform. He can outshoot his instructor now. He has been in khaki since he was a little chap. I will give him the best possible military training I can until the Government says it wants him; and his daddy has already offered to go with him. [Applause.] Any man who is willing to serve does not object to waiting until he is called, and I am rather surprised to hear men on this floor suggest that because a selective system, which means efficiency and wisdom and the use of the least number of men possible rather than the greatest we can crowd in—I am surprised to hear men suggest that there is a man in this Nation who is willing to serve under the volunteer system but is not willing to serve when the Nation calls him by selection.

I want to say another thing. It is popular to jump onto the newspapers when you can find nobody else to "cuss." But the editors of this country are just as patriotic as any other group of men. [Applause.] So far as I am concerned, the letters and telegrams which have come from my district are not those of a propaganda. They are personal letters from men whom I know, men in factories, in stores, in offices, men in high places and in low. And the significant thing of it is that 30 per cent of all the men who have written urging the conscriptive selective system are offering their services to go now. I do not find men who are willing to go objecting to the selective plan. And it is a strange message to send from the floor of this Congress that there could be found enough men in any community who, if the Nation should select those men to serve, could start a riot in opposition to the call of their country.

We are discussing, gentlemen, not the question of patriotism; we are discussing a system or a plan which has been the boast of our Government everywhere except in this. If there is anything we like to prate about it is about efficiency. We talk it everywhere. Who would imagine for one moment that in the mobilization of our industrial life we would leave it to chance and to volunteering? We are providing by our laws for this Government to take under control during this trouble every industry that is necessary, and propose that the Government shall say to that industry what it shall do, where it shall work, and how much it shall deliver for this mighty struggle. Who could think of a man organizing a great industrial plant and permitting a 50 per cent efficiency man to be put in some place where he could make only 25? This plan proposes that the 100 per cent man shall be put at the 100 per cent job, and the 50 per cent man shall be kept at his job. It appeals to common, prac-

tional horse sense. When we stop to think of organizing, if organization means anything it means there shall be some directive head; that there shall be some supervising force or mind. In the matter of our manufactures, of transportation, of finance, of supplying the foodstuffs and every other activity in our Nation, we are insisting upon organization and order and direction from a central head, until it comes to the Army, and then it is everybody's business, which means that it is nobody's business.

We should stop to consider this thing, which does not yet seem to have gotten clear home to some men, namely, that we are now at war, and at war with the most powerful military organization this world ever saw. In the second place, we have got to win! [Applause.] It does not matter how we may have felt about it before this declaration of war was made. We are now in. I am not concerned about any other thing than that this Nation shall in the quickest possible time so man and so equip its armies that the most powerful military force on earth which dared strike at Americans shall realize that when she deals with a Republic she is dealing with a people who have ability to organize and to strike as one individual. The selective plan is going through—I am convinced in my mind that we have passed the danger point—but when it shall have been adopted I hope that the gentlemen on the floor of this House who, in a moment, I believe, of unthinking speech, have suggested that the people of their district will resent it will have the courage, and the patriotism as well, to say to the men of those districts, "Let us all get ready, and when the call comes whichever man it happens to take, that man will be ready to go."

We have an illustration right here to-day. There are many heavy hearts amongst the men on the floor of this House. I have been talking with one this afternoon, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess]. He has three sons, all of military age. They have all offered themselves for service. What an honor! With what pride, even though his heart bleeds, the father should think of the three sons who have offered themselves! [Applause.] But is it not barely possible that under the selective system some of the boys might not be sent on the first draft, and instead of taking, as we heard a gentleman this morning speak of the three boys that stayed at home and the one who went to the front—instead of taking all three in the first instance, there might have been two of the boys left for later service?

Now, gentlemen, here is another thing that we have got to take into consideration: The very word "selection" means order. It means discipline. I think it was the great apostle who said that "All things should be done decently and in order." If there is any one thing that we Americans are accused of loving to do it is to make spread-eagle speeches about our own greatness and our own prowess. If there is not an opportunity to volunteer at present, I would like to know what it is that is going on down here at the Star Building and at other places night after night, with the Marine Band and some of the most eloquent gentlemen that we could find in the Halls of Congress, and in all these other places and cities throughout the country great rallies of every sort, trying to talk men into volunteering.

Everybody but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] understands that there is a call now. Some gentlemen seem not to be able to understand that volunteers are wanted because they have not heard a call, but every man who reads and walks the streets by day or by night knows that every effort has been put forth for weeks past, every energy has been directed, toward getting men into the service by speeches and advertisements at our theaters, at our picture shows, on our billboards, in our newspapers, on the sides of delivery wagons, in the sermons at church on Sunday, and everywhere we are hearing only one thing put to the men of America. If the gentleman has not heard about it, at least some of the fellows who rushed to get married had heard about it and hurried into matrimony in order that they might hide behind the skirts of the girls who were foolish enough to take them. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. With all this advertising, does the gentleman know that up to day before yesterday only 102 men had volunteered who reside in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes; I know that until day before yesterday only 102 men had volunteered who reside in the District. We all know that, and I am amazed that men should come in here and try to give the impression to the country that there is no opportunity afforded for enlistment. It only cheapens their

position when we know that everything that possibly can be done has been done to lead the boys of this country into the service.

Now there is another thing to be said to these men who are talking about robbing the homes. Where else are you going to get these men if it is not out of the homes of America? Most men have homes. I have not heard these orators say anything about the homes that were robbed of the boys of 15 up to 18, amounting to over a million and a half, during the Civil War, and I have not heard them say anything about the high-school boys who at these very hours are being graduated in advance of June, in order that whole classes might go.

Mr. DALE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. DALE of New York. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the Borough of Brooklyn, in the city of New York, the high-school boys are now attending school in full uniform?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes. My son is in uniform in the high school. On my desk are letters from parents who are just as patriotic as any haphazard volunteer advocate on this floor, who are asking that the Congressmen shall write to their boys of 16 and 17—mere lads—advising them to stay in school until they shall have finished their education and have come up to something like maturity before they go. I have not heard any of these volunteering fellows talking about those boys. The boys of the high schools are the lads who, when they hear the fife, the drum, the band, and the oratory, in their youthful enthusiasm and their desire for adventure allow their hearts to overcome their judgment. They are the fellows who sign up, and your volunteer system means just what it meant in 1861. It means that officers who are going to raise companies, and who would rather have them filled with boys of school age than not filled at all, will wink at the statements in regard to age, and we will see the same thing we saw then. If there were no other reason for voting for the selective plan, I would vote for it simply to keep those boys out of the Army until they are old enough to go. [Applause.]

Listen to me. When you are talking about "protecting boys," that means that you are to tell them not to do things that they want to do. But your other system leaves it with the boy. Again I say, that if for no other reason than for putting the responsibility of this war and its burdens upon the shoulders of citizens to whom the Government has already said, "You can have all the privileges of citizenship, and because of that you have got to bear the burdens of citizenship," I would vote for the selective plan. [Applause.]

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. Is it not possible that the reason why the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] is against this conscription plan is that he knows that under the volunteer bill the skulkers who have tried to hide themselves behind the skirts of the girls whom they have married would escape service, and that under the compulsory system some of them would have to enlist in behalf of their country? [Laughter.]

Mr. MEEKER. Yes; but please do not ask me to inquire why the gentleman from Illinois is opposed to conscription. I have tried for three days to understand his position, but I can not. I can not see how any man who dares to say a word about protecting children can refuse to vote for the only plan that will keep the children out of the Army, namely, the selective plan. [Applause.] There is a vast difference between pure sob stuff and horse sense. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. As I understand the gentleman, if the selective-draft system is adopted he opposes applying it to boys under 21 years of age?

Mr. MEEKER. Absolutely.

Mr. FIELDS. I am glad to know that.

Mr. MEEKER. Absolutely.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I guess the gentleman is aware that the bill as reported by the Army permits—

Mr. MEEKER. Oh, it is not here. I am sick and tired hearing about things that are not here.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It permits the enlistment of volunteers of 18 years in the Regular Army and in the National Guard.

Mr. MEEKER. Oh, I am talking about the selective-draft system.

Mr. FIELDS. If I may interrupt the gentleman further, there is at least that part of the administration plan of which the gentleman does not approve.

Mr. MEEKER. Oh, I am not bothering about the administration plan. I am talking about practical sense. I never followed the administration. I am for this thing, not because the President is for it, but because it is sensible and right, and I am glad he is sensible this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENT. The gentleman says the President is sensible this time?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. DENT. But the gentleman is not willing to follow the bill just as the President presents it?

Mr. MEEKER. No; I am not. Neither is the gentleman from Alabama. He has not come within a thousand miles of it. I am for one system and the gentleman from Alabama is for a double-geared concern, and it is a mighty difficult problem to ride two horses at the same time when they are going in opposite directions, as the gentleman and some others in this House have already discovered. You can not talk about the glories of the volunteer system and then when that has failed offer as a substitute your conscriptive plan. I would be man enough to stand for one or the other, and I would not pass the buck to the President when he was the President of my own party.

Now, aside from keeping the boys out of the Army, in this selective system the next thing, which is just as essential, is that it will provide for a steady supply of men for the service. We will not depend upon the oratory of the gentleman from Alabama or of the gentleman from Miami, Fla. And by the way, men, if it were not to call up bitter thoughts of the past, I would talk to those who in the past have held back our defense plans. I believe in laying the responsibility where it belongs. I want the men of this House who for the past three years have been opposing us and calling those of us cowards who have been working for a preparedness program that would have given us all the guns and clothing and everything we need—I want those men to understand that the condition we are in to-day lies at their door. [Applause.]

It is a mighty cheap thing for a man to do a thing of that sort, and when he comes to the test try to lay the responsibility somewhere else. We know why we are not prepared. We men here know who it has been in the last four years who have been sowing the seed in opposition to America equipping herself to take care of herself in this world war. As we have now entered at one door, let us not fool ourselves into believing that possibly before we are through we will not be involved with others than that nation against whom war has been declared. The moment we begin to sing ourselves into the belief that we are safe because we are big and lubberly and fat and rich, we have begun to sing our funeral dirge. These active nations of the world, who think only of themselves and of their interests, are going to take advantage of our unpreparedness and of our awkwardness with a gun and of our strange maneuvers in trying to get ready for war. Let us remember that every flounder we make, every misstep that we make, is judged by the enemy against whom we are pitted as evidence that we can not do anything but talk. There could no better and no more effective notice go to the Imperial Government of Germany as to what America will do—not what she says she will do, but what America will do—than the news that America has adopted a practical, sensible plan of supplying 1,000,000, 3,000,000, 20,000,000 trained men, if necessary. [Applause.] If there is anything that appeals to a German mind it is efficiency. That gets clear home to him, for he has got the most efficient fighting force all the way through that the world has ever yet seen. And every awkward step we make, every delay that occurs from this moment on—ah, even in the years gone by, in our experience in Mexico, in our attitude elsewhere—from all these things the world had been led to believe that we would not fight, and the world is not right sure of it yet. We have voted money; we have got more of that than anything else. We float bonds and take interest on the bonds, but, gentlemen, that is not war. There is just one last place where that will be decided, and that is where the armies of the two nations come face to face. When the man on the other side, facing the man on this side, knows that he is a better trained man, that he knows how to use the machinery that he has at hand, and that when he turns loose one of those messengers of death and hell he knows that his aim is deadly, will he respect and fear him as an opponent.

That great soldier of peace, Grant, who was the most merciless warrior America ever produced while he was in a battle, was the first general of the northern army who realized that the only way to stop that war was to make it such a hell of destruction that the men on the other side could not stand it. And

that is the way with every war. We talk about the Civil War. We had volunteers on both sides; but oh, to read the story of how those high-spirited men died in swamps and on hillsides and everywhere because of the ignorance of army life is sickening. There sits before me my colleague from St. Louis [Mr. DYER], a veteran of the Spanish War. There are many of them here on this floor, and so far as I can ascertain they are all for the conscriptive plan, so that "George" shall not do it all this time. Let the men who served in that war, many of whom never reached foreign shores at all, tell you what occurred to thousands upon thousands of the boys who intrusted themselves in that volunteer scheme. I tell you, gentlemen, this is a test of the practical organizing sense of the American Congress. Upon the one side there is no greater patriotism than on the other. Nobody has a corner on that. Neither Congressmen nor editors nor preachers nor farmers nor bankers nor anybody else has a monopoly on patriotism, and it rather disgusts me to hear men talking about it. We are here to-day to determine whether we shall announce to the world that America can not only mobilize her industries, her transportation facilities, her money, and her food products, but that at the same time she can do that bigger thing, learn to think and act as under the direction of a single mind. Somewhere in every great struggle, at last, one mind must direct all. We can not have a division of counsel. We must have in this as in any other war—because we are going against a nation that is a solid unit—we must have a body of trained men, hard as steel, who serve because they are called and selected, and not because of some beautiful sentiment which they may have. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, any personal views I may have I am willing to yield temporarily to the judgment of those upon whom rests the responsibility of conducting the war. This is not the time for a division of sentiment between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Each one must bend all his energies toward doing his bit in any capacity in which he may be of use and service to his country. [Applause.] Hard, practical common sense, not theories, must be applied in the wise solution of the great problems under consideration. The advice of those who know from bitter experience what we should do and do promptly should not be ignored. I would not regard my opinion as a civilian upon the best method of raising efficient armies in the shortest possible time entitled to serious consideration.

The Government has educated and trained officers of the Army and the Navy upon whom necessarily must rest the responsibility of conducting the war successfully. These officers with great unanimity endeavor to impress upon us what legislative action should be taken in this national emergency. So far as I am concerned I feel bound, basing my official action upon the sole consideration of the best interests of my country, to accept their advice. We must give to them what they say they must have to conduct the war to a speedy and successful conclusion. It is apparent that they regard time a vital element in the premises. We should respond promptly and unitedly, and vigorously sustain and support them during the period of the war. [Applause.]

I have never been in favor, and am not now in favor, of establishing a military oligarchy in this country. But the Nation is at war, the Government is in peril, and we are informed by the Executive, who must be presumed to have complete information before him, that the rights, the liberties, and the freedom of democracies are threatened with destruction in this titanic conflict between democracy and autocracy. Under such circumstances, and in view of the exigencies of the hour, we should not hesitate, in my judgment, to accept the recommendations of those to whom we must intrust in time of war the security and perpetuity of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, in my speech of yesterday I made use of certain figures relative to the ages of volunteers in the Civil War which I stated I had secured from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Saturday, placed there by Senator NELSON. Before making the speech I requested the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Congressional Library to verify, if possible, those figures. I received no report until this afternoon, and I find from the official report a substantial error in the figures that I gave. They gave me some unofficial figures that greatly vary. The one official report that they referred me to is a letter written to Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, on March 20, 1916, and placed by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21,

1916, written by the present Commissioner of Pensions. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, March 20, 1916.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: In compliance with your verbal request of to-day, I have the honor to hand you herewith what is believed to be a correct statement of the relative ages of the men who enlisted in the Union Army during the Civil War.

Trusting that this will serve your purpose, I am,

Very truly, yours,

G. M. SALTZGABER, Commissioner.

Age at enlistment—1861-1865.

The records of the office of The Adjutant General, United States Army, show that in the War of the Rebellion the enlisted men consisted as follows:

Those 10 years and under	25
Those 11 years and under	38
Those 12 years and under	225
Those 13 years and under	300
Those 14 years and under	1,523
Those 15 years and under	104,987
Those 16 years and under	231,051
Those 17 years and under	844,891
Those 18 years and under	1,151,438
Those 21 years and under (these two classes make the total number of enlistments)	2,159,798
Those 22 years and over (these two classes make the total number of enlistments)	618,511
Those 25 years and over	46,626
Those 44 years and over	16,071

Total men enlisted 2,778,304. The estimated number of individuals in service is given as 2,213,365.

On that occasion the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] took occasion to say:

I had the privilege shortly after I came to Congress as a Member of the House to dine one evening when Gen. Sheridan, Gen. Sherman, Gen. Logan, and quite a number of others were present. I did not do any talking, but I did a good job of listening. I never shall forget that Gen. Sheridan made the statement that if it had not been for the boys under 21 years of age we could not have succeeded in that great struggle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to be accurate in the figures that I give on all occasions. I make this statement for the purpose of correcting the figures given by me yesterday. I want to say, however, that they do not in the least degree affect the force of the argument that I made on yesterday, because under this official report nearly 50 per cent of the volunteers of the Civil War were boys 18 years of age and less, and nearly 80 per cent, according to this report, of the men in the Civil War were boys of the age of 21 years and less.

I understand the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] made an attack on the figures given by me yesterday. I want to say that the figures I now give under this official report serve every purpose for the argument, and if the gentleman from South Carolina cares to question these figures, his attack must not be upon me; it must not be on Senator NELSON; but he must attack the present Commissioner of Pensions, who made the report, a Democrat appointed by the President of the United States—a Democrat! [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH].

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I can not vote for this bill if its volunteering features are stricken out as proposed. I will vote for it if such features are retained, out of deference to the judgment of the President, assuming that his wishes are correctly reported to us by the war journals and by those of our House leaders who are supposed to speak for him, although some of its other provisions, its colossal magnitude, its suggestions of close foreign cooperation and possible future entanglements, contrary to American ideals and contrary to the thought of many Members of the House when they voted for the declaration of war believing, as they did at the time, it was to be an American war, waged by American volunteer soldiers in defense of American rights ruthlessly invaded by the German Kaiser, as set forth in the President's address. Members of Congress of all parties were willing to trust the management of such a war to the President and his official advisers under American plans, not expecting them to resort to royal ways or royal advice.

Consideration of my own duty, therefore, in regard to the measure has been largely confined to the question of conscription without first giving the citizen, able and willing to serve his country, an opportunity to volunteer in its defense whenever or however it may be attacked. Conscription, without such opportunity, is, in my judgment, unrepugnant and un-American. It is a stigma upon patriotism. Its advocates are fundamentally wrong in their basic conceptions. They declaim loudly about universal military service being the duty of every citizen

of the State, but they strangely omit to mention the fact that in a Republic the people are the State and that therefore the duty they proclaim is but the ordinary reciprocal obligations of good citizenship, universal and binding alike upon all who would enjoy the blessings of a republican form of government. It is a proud privilege, a freeman's heritage, a most sacredly guarded right of the citizen to voluntarily join his copatriots in defense of their common country when assailed without being conscripted or unjustly classed with the unwilling or unworthy. Conscription implies involuntary servitude by force, a stigma not to be put upon the patriotic citizenship of a Republic excepting only when the volunteer system fails to produce satisfactory results.

This has been the rule of the Republic ever since its foundation. It has brought victory and never defeat to the Stars and Stripes. Its virtue has never heretofore been questioned. But it is now said a great emergency has arisen and that there is no time to study the historic lessons of our own Republic, founded by George Washington and his compeers, and that, therefore, American traditions and ideals must be abandoned and the old, old lights of the world invoked for our own immediate guidance.

A great English general, hero of nine wars and first British officer to meet the German line, according to reports in our war journals, tells us that the volunteer system is a failure. But his viewpoint is from that of a monarchy; he speaks for the citizenship of a Kingdom, not of a Republic. A study of some of the great battles of our Civil War, fought by volunteer soldiers, Federals and Confederates, might tell a different story.

The wheels of progress and thought are to be turned backward toward militarism, backward toward a condition which our modern Secretary of War, in his letter to Chairman DENT, calls a "philosophy." So be it. This bill with its elastic volunteering feature provides for just such supposed contingency, but it places the responsibility where it justly belongs—with the President. The House committee has wisely provided that—

In the event the President decides that such additional force or forces shall not have been effectually raised under the call for volunteers as herein provided the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to raise by draft as herein provided, organize and equip an additional force of 500,000 enlisted men, or such part or parts thereof as he may at any time deem necessary.

No limitation as to time is put upon this power of the President. If in his judgment conditions exist warranting it, he has power to so order at any time after volunteering begins. It is left discretionary with him; he is the sole judge, and the bill does not seek to restrain this exercise of executive power.

Early after the election of the President last fall, induced largely by the cry that "he kept us out of war," I resolved, as a matter of patriotic duty, to stand by his administration in so far as conscience would permit. I resolved in my humble way, waiving all conditions not vital to conscience, to follow his leadership. I have tried in this respect to be true to my country's best interest according to the light God has given me.

In this spirit I voted approval of the ill-starred expeditions into Mexico, although not entirely convinced that the Taft policy was wrong in declaring an embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition across the Rio Grande and keeping the American Army encamped on the north bank ready to protect and defend American life and property from any and all assailants.

I voted without question for the President's modest recommendations, as originally made, for increasing our Army, relying, like a majority of American voters, upon his campaign promises.

I voted to sustain him in his German diplomatic letter writing, believing it to be in line with a well-considered policy of avoiding actual rupture with a great nation with which we had been at peace all our national life.

I voted approval of his severance of diplomatic relations, although I felt some hesitation, thinking possibly the necessity might have been avoided by a little stricter adherence to our announced policy of neutrality and the exercise of more real diplomacy in dealing with the German embassy at Washington.

I voted for the authority asked by the President and his advisers to arm American merchant vessels to defend against German submarines, which now on all hands seems to have been a useless waste of patriotism.

I voted for the declaration of war asked for by the President, yielding much of my own judgment to what I believed to be a patriotic duty, and to the necessarily superior knowledge of facts on the part of the President and his legal advisers.

I voted, with confessed misgivings as to where it might lead us but in accordance with my desire to patriotically stand by

the President, for the \$7,000,000,000 appropriation asked to carry on the war, the immensity of which is staggering and has no parallel in history.

I have expressed my willingness to vote for this bill giving, as it does, to the President an absolute war power greater than that ever conferred upon king or potentate, saving only that over the life and death of the subject, if only the ideals of the Republic and its founders can be preserved and militarism pure and simple be thus avoided in the land of Washington and Lincoln. Conscription, in my judgment, without opportunity given to the citizen to first volunteer in defense of his country, leads directly to militarism. It is the sure precursor of the man on horseback; yea, more in these modern days, it heralds the motor truck with Army supplies overriding the people and crushing out all semblance of liberty in a land where now none but freemen live.

I can not follow the President in this.

I must answer to what seems to me a higher duty.

I criticize no one who differs with me.

I answer only to my own conscience, to my ideas of an overruling Providence, feeling that I am immune from the embittered charge of political self-seeking hurled against Members of the House who do not in this instance support the Army Staff ideas, not expecting again to be a candidate for Congress and having no future earthly ambition except to do my duty as God gives me to see it during this Congress, the most important parliamentary body ever assembled in the history of the world. I shall hope, however, if I live until March 4, 1919, to take home to my constituents a clear conscience and a pair of clean hands. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman is a veteran of the Union Army, is he not?

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. I am.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not a fact that the experience of the gentleman was that the conscripts were never men who would stand the fire; that conscription was a failure in the Civil War to a very great extent?

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. I do not know much about this conscript business. We were all volunteers in the company in which I served. I was one of the boys under 17—16, a private—and did all that I could, and I did not concern myself much about who was a conscript. But I will say this: I attend Grand Army reunions, and I mingle with the boys who served in the Civil War and in the War with Spain, and I have never yet been able to find a man who would admit that he was a conscript. [Applause.] They will not do it, and I defy anyone who may speak upon this subject to name one man who served in any army who will admit that he was a conscript.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, on the 6th day of December, 1915, upon the opening of the Congress of that year, I had the honor to present to this House H. R. 621, which contained the provision authorizing the expenditure of \$1,000,000,000 to be divided equally between the Army and the Navy, such money to be expended on the advice of the General Boards of both of these departments by the Secretaries of those departments, the money to be spent purely for equipment, ordnance, and munitions. At that time this measure seemed to be looked upon by this House and by a good part of the people of the country as more or less of a wild proposition. I am simply bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this time for the purpose of pointing out that if this measure had been given the consideration that it was entitled to, we would now find ourselves with sufficient equipment on hand to supply the first increment of the new army that we hope to provide for by this bill that we are now discussing, and we would also have saved to the Government of the United States not less than \$300,000,000. I believe every man in this House will concede that there is not a single item that I have mentioned but what could have been purchased in December, 1915, for 30 per cent less than we can purchase these items to-day.

In considering the relative merits of the plans of selective conscription and volunteer service for the raising of an army of the size required for the present emergency, it seems to me that it is well to look at the matter from two principal standpoints. In the first place, which plan is best economically; and, in the second place, which plan will produce the most efficient army in the shortest time.

I am well aware of the fact that in the past the United States has always placed great dependence upon voluntary service. Essentially we are not by nature a military people and we have taken great pride in the fact that our wars have

been won by the patriotic few. The fact that wars to-day are not won by the conflict of arms alone is apparent to anyone who has given the matter thought. Behind the bulwark of the Army and the Navy the great industries of the Nation must go on, not only without the slightest curtailment of production but with that production multiplied manifold by the increased demands of the war. We have absolutely no right to enact into law a method of procedure which does not take fully into consideration the requirements of the war from an industrial standpoint.

The principle of selective draft or conscription rests squarely upon the assumption that the defense of the Nation should be directly in the hands of the citizens who compose it. Not a part of them but all of them. Under the volunteer system the first men to answer the call are those who have already made good in their chosen work, whatever it may be, for they are the kind of men who do things. The ne'er-do-wells, the tramps, the incompetents are the last to go and then usually under a draft. It is easy to conceive of entire industries being forced completely out of business while others go on practically unaffected, due simply to the fact that the employees of the one may be more patriotic than those of the other. The effect upon the industries of the country of voluntary service is a serious matter. We have all of us witnessed within the past few years the struggle made by England to equip and maintain in the field that first little volunteer army. It was only when the English Government had awakened fully to the defects of the volunteer plan and had by selective conscription replaced on the firing line in France the men who were needed at home to carry on the industries of a Government at war that they were able to make a beginning of that industrial and military preparedness which is to-day bearing the fruits of victory.

Selective conscription as advocated by the administration and favored by me, will have absolutely no adverse effect on the manufacturing and farming of the country. It is proposed that all able-bodied men, with certain specific exemptions, between the ages of 19 and 25, shall be made available. It is estimated that this provision will produce 7,000,000. It is also estimated that one-half of these will eventually be rejected for one cause or another, leaving 3,500,000 to select from, and that the number required at any one time shall be proportioned among the congressional districts, of which there are 435. Assuming, in round numbers, that there are an average of 116 election districts in each congressional district, a simple calculation discloses the fact that out of every election district 69 men would be required to produce an ultimate Army after all increments had been added of 3,500,000. In other words, on the first call for 500,000 each election district on an average would be required to furnish from 8 to 9 men.

Not an enormous matter, and as far as the industries of the Nation are concerned, a negligible quantity. Any plan that does not fully consider the effect of the sudden withdrawal from the mills and farms of the men who are absolutely essential to the increased demands of production is totally inadequate to meet the present situation.

Let us look at the question for a moment from the standpoint of the young man whose services will be required. In the first place the plan breathes the spirit of a true democracy. The service must be universal. The son of the rich man and the son of the poor man must drill shoulder to shoulder. Absolutely the only persons exempt will be those not physically fit or those who for some reason are the only support of their parent or parents. Will not this provision by itself eventually serve to crystallize in the minds of the coming generation that in the common defense, class distinction and pride of position have no part whatsoever.

In return for the increased measure of service that a young man will be able to render his country in time of need, he will receive for himself a training and a discipline which will be of inestimable value to him throughout his future life. In proportion as he becomes a better soldier will he become a better citizen. No man can go through a course of military training without coming out of it a better man physically and mentally. He will be subjected to a wise discipline and a thorough education in self-reliance.

When we get down to a consideration of the relative merits of the two plans from the point of the efficiency of the Army to be raised, there is a great deal of valuable information available, if we care to make use of it. In the first place, the principle of selective conscription is the carefully worked-out plan of men who know what they are talking about. It should be obvious that a department of the Government whose duty it is to study the question from every possible angle, with a wealth of data available, is in a position to draw up a proposition that

will be sound from a military point of view. I believe that the General Staff has presented through this measure such a proposition.

Even those of us who are not proficient in things military have read history and have seen demonstrated time and again in our own country and in others all of the evils of the volunteer system.

The particularly vicious feature of the amendment providing for the calling out of an army of volunteers is found in the provision that the company commissioned officers may be selected from among the various local contingents. With our eyes fully open to the grave dangers surrounding it, we are preparing to return to a system of political appointments—a system which absolutely destroyed the efficiency of the National Army in the first years of the Civil War.

This war is not for amateurs. It is a serious business. Do I want my sons, do you want your sons to volunteer to serve their country knowing that they must be clothed, fed, maintained, and finally be led into battle by a man who, no matter how high his motives may be, is not fully qualified by all the experience and training possible? I think not. I protest against it. I believe that when our young men go into this war we should be very sure that we have given them every fighting chance to the end they may eventually come back home and take their places in the pursuits of peace. Are we giving them this chance unless we insist that those to whose care they are intrusted are absolutely the best that the world can produce?

Gentlemen, I believe firmly in the principle of selective conscription and shall vote for it. I believe that in the last analysis it will be found the only method that will produce the results that are absolutely essential to the peace and well-being of this Nation. Without our desire we have been forced to take a hand in the shaping of the destinies of the nations of the earth. Fortunate indeed are we that up to the present moment it has not been necessary for us to participate actively in the struggle from which we have stood afar off and watched. Who can foretell the moment we will be called upon? When the time comes they will go. There is no question about that. They always have. Millions will answer, your sons and my sons, whether we want them to or not, untrained, most of them, not properly equipped; and we will watch them go with the full knowledge that we are sending them off to die for their country with the handicap of a mistaken policy hanging like a millstone around their necks.

Is it not time that we approached this question unflinchingly, to the end that by a system of selective conscription we shall give to the youth of this country an opportunity, nay, more than that, a duty to prepare themselves for the great work that they may be called upon to perform? [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COADY].

Mr. COADY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the experience of England in the present war and our own experience in the Civil War, the action of the majority members of the Military Affairs Committee is, to my mind, inconceivable.

They admit there is some doubt as to the success of the voluntary plan they advocate by the insertion of the provision for selective draft as an alternative for voluntary enlistment in the event of the failure of a sufficient number of men to volunteer; or, as they say in their report, in the event the President decides that the force to be raised shall not have been effectually raised and maintained under the call for volunteers they provide for then there shall be conscription. Yet they ask this House to adopt a plan that is clouded in doubt. The gentleman from Alabama, the able and popular chairman of the committee, in his opening speech says he went to the President and Secretary of War with every proposition of compromise trying to bring about unity of action. Is not this another admission that the majority members of the committee were not sure that their plan would produce quick and satisfactory results?

If they had confidence in their own plan they should have stuck to their colors and never raised the banner of compromise. There is a principle involved in this proposition—the principle of justice and fair dealing—and you can not compromise a principle. The gentleman from New York in the minority views submitted by him says the bill makes it necessary to try out the volunteer system or declare it a failure before the draft can be put in operation.

Here we are at war with the greatest military power the world has ever seen and we are asked to resort to an experiment.

Nero fiddles while Rome burns. This is no time for experimenting. Let us adopt a plan that is sure of producing quick and satisfactory results and not dillydally with a problematical

system of obtaining an army. Let us profit by the experience of others. It is ridiculous, it is nonsensical not to do so. Why try a plan that has broken down whenever and wherever tried; and why turn down a plan that is prepared and recommended by military experts? I know there is a disposition on the part of a number of Members of this House to resent any suggestions coming from the War and Navy Departments; but for myself I am willing to subordinate my judgment to the combined judgment of men trained in the science of warfare and whose whole lives have been devoted to its study.

If we can not rely on the advice of our military officers, trained and educated at West Point, officers who for bravery, intelligence, and ability are not surpassed by those of any other nation, then we must admit that that great institution of learning is a failure and the millions of dollars we have spent for its maintenance have been spent in vain.

Whilst I am ready and willing to rely on such advice for guidance in matters of this kind, I am not compelled to do so at this time, because abundant testimony has been furnished this House of the ineffectiveness of the volunteer system and the fairness and effectiveness of the selective-draft plan.

The sentiment in favor of the latter plan is stronger than some Members of this House imagine, and it is not confined to the big cities.

The demand for its adoption comes from the rural districts as well; and I know that Members from such districts have been in receipt of hundreds of telegrams and letters in its favor and demanding that they stand back of the President, as all patriotic Americans should now do. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I remember to have heard a lecture by Elbert Hubbard, the famous Philistine, just a week before he sailed on the ill-fated *Lusitania*, which took him down to a watery grave, the victim of a Prussian torpedo. He described the experiences he had in a New York insane asylum. He said he had gone through the building and over the grounds of the asylum. Out from the buildings, probably a mile, he came upon a little guard about five and a half feet tall in charge of 25 of the huskiest insane inmates he had ever seen in his life. That little fellow was in absolute charge of the 25. Hubbard said he watched him for some time and then went down and spoke to the guard. He said, "I would like to ask you one question. What would you do if these 25 powerful fellows should get together and come at you all at once? You have no weapon, not even a club. What would you do?" He said that the guard looked up at him with a quizzical smile and said, "My friend, you belong here all right. What would I do if these 25 should get together and come at me all at once? Why, if they could get together with anybody or anything they would not be here. That is the trouble with them; that's why they're in an insane asylum."

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it is the test of sanity to be able to get together in such a moment as this. Because I believe that getting together means coordination of all American activities, our military and our industrial as well, I am earnestly in favor of the selective draft as advocated by the President and the War Department. That means we act as a unit. It means that there is a real America, an organized nation. Whittier saw that in days of another crisis, when he said:

Like warp and woof our destinies are woven fast.
All linked together like the keys of an organ vast.
Tear one thread and the web ye mar.
Break but one of a thousand keys
And the paining jar
Through all shall run.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much of the failures of the volunteer system in our own country in every war in which we have been engaged and in England during this war.

Even if the volunteer system would bring to the standards of America the millions of men needed in this gigantic conflict, and even the majority of the Military Affairs Committee, which brings out this bill, does not believe it will do that, it would be a fatal mistake to adopt it. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has ably emphasized that fact.

Fully as important in modern warfare as the man in the firing line is the man behind the fighting line. There must be skilled men in the mines and mills and factories and on the farms if the soldier is to be effective at the front.

In fact, the entire Nation must be mobilized, and to accomplish it there must be some power to direct the disposal of the Nation's resources in man power, to say to some, "Go," and they must go, and to others, "Stay," and they must stay. This can only be done if we recognize without quibble and equivocation that every man owes his services to his country, to be used where they are most valuable.

There is one rule of conduct which must be established, and that is that the Government shall compel the individual to relinquish self-will and self-interest when the safety of the Nation demands it.

Here is the fundamental difference between those who advocate the volunteer system and those who adhere to the principle of universal service. It is the age-old struggle between personal liberty and the common welfare, between individual rights and social obligations.

That has been the storm center around which has raged many strenuous conflicts in time of peace. Never has there been an attempt in this Congress to advance social and industrial justice but opponents have declared that such legislation was an interference with the sacred personal liberty of the individual. The public-school system, pure-food laws, railroad regulation, temperance legislation, and many other measures have been denounced as paternalistic and despotic attempts to restrict personal liberty.

But actual conditions in time of peace were the most effective arguments as to the menace contained in the philosophy of stark individualism. Its Ishmael tendency to put every man's hand against his neighbor, with no motive save selfish individual interest, had become a sullen incentive to anarchy and strife. The existence of a jungle warfare was bound to have the result it did have—the triumph of the strong and the crushing of the weak.

In pioneer days the principle of individual, independent action was effective and beneficial. But the changing conditions which transformed the Nation from an agricultural community into a nation of closely organized industries made the ideas of individual liberty as misleading as the guideposts to the German armies in the campaign of 1866 after the Austrians had turned them the wrong way.

We could not have gone much further even in peace on the theory of "every man for himself." The report of the United States Industrial Commission as to the causes of social unrest in this country is an eloquent revelation of the results due to the practical application of that theory. It shows clearly the injustice and inequity which results when personal liberty is put above the common good. I had earnestly hoped that the battle between these opposing ideas would be fought out in times of peace when the entire attention of the Nation could be centered upon them. There can be no doubt as to the end of the contest in favor of the common welfare over private advantage.

But now with the Nation at war the fundamental issues involved, though strange and new in appearance, are the same in reality. We are in the position of a town whose citizens had been called in mass meetings to consider plans for the common welfare. The interests that sought to profit by the exploitation of the many were being shorn of their power to prey. The welfare of the town itself was being put above the rights of a few powerful citizens.

Then suddenly comes the cry of "Fire!" Instantly the meeting is forgotten and the citizens rush to meet this menace. But now the efforts of all are required and each man must perform his duty. If responsibility for fighting the flames is placed upon a few, while the many hold their hands from helping, there will be no town left to benefit and all the measures for the public welfare will be of no avail.

That is the situation in America. The fire of war has endangered our safety and our future existence. Gone is the motto, "Every man for himself," and in its place rises a nobler slogan, "Each for all, all for each, and all together for a common cause."

In fact, the very war in which we are engaged is a struggle between the very elements which were contending for mastery in American life. On one side is the Imperial German Government, the very embodiment of the law of the jungle, the power of the mailed fist. For ourselves we have solemnly chosen to stand on the side of equal opportunity for all, the rights of man called "million," and the obligations of the fraternity of nations.

Now, in such a conflict shall the national defense be regarded as a choice for the individual or a matter of obligation resting upon every citizen alike? Shall we depend upon voluntary enlistment for military service and voluntary contribution of the necessary money, or shall we require both men and money to the full limit of the Nation's need?

To my mind, there can be no choice here. I have advocated measures time and again which recognized the superior claims of the common welfare over personal liberty. I have consistently maintained that this Government, instead of keeping its hands off everything except the preservation of law and order, should put its hands on everything whereby it could best serve the public good.

Now, in the test of war I can not hesitate to follow the same course and speak and vote for the principle of universal service and the obligation that every citizen owes his Nation in time of need.

I have heard gentlemen declaim as to the essential freedom of the volunteer system and the slave character of universal service.

Even if the volunteer system meant really the free choice of every individual, it would have no force against the need of the Nation for varied kinds of service. But does volunteering mean the absence of coercion? Experience proves that it rests upon the most relentless and unreasoning form of coercion possible—public ridicule and vituperation. The brand of cowardice and the stain of recreancy to duty is put upon those who refuse to enlist. White-feather devices are used to shame men into offering their services, and the contemptuous looks of men and women sear the souls of those who may have good reasons for not enlisting. The system makes necessary the arousing of white-hot passions and prejudices. Freedom of speech and press must be limited in such a campaign, since the publication of the truth would hinder recruiting.

The fact is there is less coercion in the determination that all shall recognize the obligation of service, each in his place of duty, than in a system which depends for military service upon the whips and scorns of bitter speech and slurs. The history of volunteering shows more evils of restricted liberty and compulsion than any system of universal service we can establish by law. Others have said here on this floor that the system of universal service is revolutionary and introduces an entirely new principle in American life. On the contrary, the principle is the logical development of the plan laid down by the founders of the Government and the framers of the first laws for the Nation.

The act of May 8, 1792, passed just three years after George Washington was inaugurated President of the United States, was a definite recognition of the principle of universal service, and it continued in force until its repeal some 14 years ago. It provided for the training of all citizens between the age of 18 and 45, and requires each man to provide his own weapons and equipment.

Thomas Jefferson, one of the great believers in democracy, in a letter written in 1813, had the following to say on the subject:

I think the truth must now be obvious that our people are too happy at home to enter into the regular military service, and that we can not be defended but by making every citizen a soldier, as the Greeks and Romans, who had no standing armies; and that in doing this all must be marshaled, classed by their ages, and every service ascribed to its competent class.

Washington was a firm believer in universal service and advocated it on many occasions as the only method for adequate national defense.

Mr. Chairman, during this debate gentlemen have said that the universal service idea embodied in the minority report on this bill is essentially militaristic. I would like to ask what militarism is? Is it not a system whose very lifeblood is the domination of the few over the many? Militarism implies a despot ruler and a subject people. It is possible only where government is in the hands of irresponsible power. There can not be militarism in a democracy, a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Any measures of national defense taken by a people's government are self-imposed. They are based on the principle of self-help, the imposition of military measures upon the people by the people themselves.

German militarism is a menace to world freedom, not because it means universal training and preparedness for defense, not because it requires time and money to guard against sudden peril. It is a peril because it is a weapon in the hands of autocrats who advocate the doctrine that might makes right and that brute force is the only true test of a nation's strength. It proclaims the value of war for war's sake and holds a people as helpless slaves before its tyrannical power.

There need be no fear of the establishment of militarism under the system of universal service. You could not recruit a single regiment in all America to carry out the orders for ruthless warfare, such as has characterized Prussocracy in Belgium and France and on the high seas. No more can you erect a militarism in a nation where the people insist that its army must be its servant and not its master.

Mr. Chairman, it can not be denied that there is widespread opposition to the idea of universal military service among the people of America. But this opposition is not against the principle so much as the injustice of expecting all men to perform equal obligations when they are not accorded equal rights.

This opposition, expressed in bitter attacks upon "conscription," is by no means due to the selfish desire to enjoy rights while the fulfillment of duties is evaded. It does not come from peace-at-any-price pacifists, nor from pro-Germans. It comes from true-blue American citizens, and it demands the most thoughtful determination to remedy the conditions responsible for the feeling.

You can not expect a tremendous desire for sacrifice from those who have been exploited and oppressed until they feel that they have no real stake in the country. When men are consistently denied their rights of protection against rapacious and conscienceless interests, they can not be expected to rush violently to the performance of duties which are supposed to depend upon those rights.

I want to say that there are millions of American citizens who to-day are burning under a sense of injustice in social and industrial relations. Nor is it a captious or fanciful assumption, but one based upon tragic reality.

Since this European conflict began the rising prices of every necessity of life have spelled privation and suffering. The increase in wages have meant nothing, for it was more than eaten up in increased prices. During a period of widely heralded prosperity, when great industrial corporations were declaring dividends of a hundred per cent and more, and the papers were full of the immense profits made from war materials, the workers have endured hunger and hardship. Though the toll never so hard and long, they found a steadily increasing gap between their incomes and the expenditure necessary to maintain themselves and families in any degree of comfort. For two years and more the cost of living has been ascending the scale and the situation in hundreds of thousands of American families has been growing more intolerable.

To fan the flames of discontent these workers have seen their efforts to organize for better protection beaten down brutally by these same prosperous corporations which had been receiving such bountiful gifts from the cornucopia of war-created profits. It is a fundamental right that the labor of this country be permitted to organize for collective action. Without it there can be no equality in the relations of capital and labor, and yet this right has been bludgeoned from hosts of American workers.

Is it any wonder that industrial workers everywhere in America are lukewarm to arguments of universal obligations in a democracy, especially when they see in the foremost rank of the spokesmen for such obligations the very men who have persistently and venomously fought against unionism and every attempt to secure a measure of democracy in industry?

Think of the situation right here in Washington. The head of the Washington Railway & Electric Railway Co. arbitrarily refused to permit organization of the employees of that company. Eleven hundred men were locked out when they insisted upon this right, and strike breakers were imported and put to work in their places. With an iron hand this despot of street car transportation crushed the effort of these men to secure their just demand.

Then in the very midst of such a situation this same man, with a fanfare of publicity, erects a great sign on Pennsylvania Avenue bearing the slogan in flaming words, "The Navy Needs You. America First."

For my part, I can readily understand why every man of the 1,100 employees of this street car company, their dependent ones, and their friends would view that sign with resentment and as a fiery insult.

The same thing is true elsewhere. What more biting sarcasm in very truth than that same cry of "America first" from those who have consistently fought to put Americans last.

That is the kind of injustice that has poisoned the high purpose and in some measure nullified the enthusiasm of the Nation. The profitters from privilege and the preyers upon the poor are in great part responsible for the sincere protests which are being made against universal service. They have brought us to the pass where American ideals seem blurred and American patriotism chilled.

But let it not be understood that these men are disloyal or that they are recreant to duty in any way. They are in fact the most sublimely patient citizens in all America and they are ready and eager to do that beyond which no man should be required to do—match their rights with their duties.

I am confident that the workers of America will support the principle of universal service for the common good. All they ask is that the principle be put into effect in everyday affairs, as well as military service. They are ready to do what they have always done—bear the burdens of fighting America's wars—but they demand a square deal for themselves and families, no more and no less.

Among the very first expressions of loyalty to the Government in this crisis was the declaration of the American Federation of Labor. Here is what that organization said:

We, with the ideals of liberty and justice herein declared as the indispensable basis for national policies, offer our services to our country in every field of activity to defend, safeguard, and preserve the Republic of the United States against its enemies, whosoever they may be, and we call upon our fellow workers and fellow citizens in the holy name of labor, justice, and freedom to devotedly and patriotically give their service.

There can be no more sincere and noble pledge of loyalty than that, and it is the expression of genuine Americanism.

The masses of the American people will gladly accept the principle of universal service as soon as they understand that it is to be universal, without unfair advantages to wealth and influence. They are eternally opposed to a large standing Army in this country, an immense professional organization of mercenary soldiers. They know such an army would be a perpetual threat to labor and that universal service will be assurance as much against terrorism within as without.

The great majority of Americans now are ready for conscription of men if with it goes conscription of wealth. They will not consent to sacrifice themselves in order that a few men may add to their fortunes.

One thing is essential in the conduct of this war. There must be no unjust profits in it to any one. And as the Government takes men and does not borrow them, so it must take money, not borrow it. Excess profits over a small percentage should be conscripted to pay the costs of this war. The peaks of large incomes and fortunes should be conscripted to pay war expenses. Human rights are higher than property rights and common justice demands that if those who are best able to fight are required to fight, those who are best able to pay shall be required to pay.

This conscription of wealth can not, of course, be provided for in this measure, but it can and must be in the tax bill which is soon to be reported.

Other measures can make real the principle that equal obligation go hand in hand with equal rights and privileges. Governmental control of every food supply in the country and the elimination of every food shark and speculator will give the inalienable rights of life and liberty to those who feel that at present they are eating the scanty and bitter bread of oppression.

More than that, America must not allow the defenders, raised under this bill, to be assailed and despoiled by the liquor traffic. When these hundreds of thousands of soldiers are gathered in mobilization camps their health, their morale, and their welfare are again a matter of universal obligation. We must see to it that the Government immediately exercises its authority to prohibit the sale of liquor to American soldiers, in uniform or in civilian clothes and in a wide zone around every concentration camp. The mothers who give their boys to the Nation's safety will not hold us guiltless if we permit the wanton defiling of that sacrifice.

Because I believe the principle of universal service is right and just and fair, and because I believe that these other phases of the same principle can be and will be enacted into law, I am unhesitating in my support of the President's plan of a selective draft.

I am convinced that its adoption now will show more effectively than was ever done before the interdependence of the American citizenship.

That relationship exists in peace as in war. And I warn you that an unjust carrying out of that principle, making it refer only to the Army in time of conflict, will be a perilous course.

We are going to compel all to accept and endure sacrifice as a common obligation. Let us face every condition in America to-day in the same "together" spirit, realizing that an injustice done to the poorest, weakest citizen in America is an injustice done to all.

There are only Americans and anti-Americans now. The most dangerous anti-American of all is the man or set of men who will not act and work for the common welfare.

This war in which we have engaged is a noble enterprise. It must not—it shall not—be made a force of reaction and despair for the American people. Rather it must be a new birth of freedom, through which our institutions may be revitalized with new purpose. It must bring us to the day when every citizen shall have equal rights with every other citizen, and equal obligations.

Mr. Chairman, the biggest word in America to-day is "together." As the Commander in Chief of the Army stated in his inspiring message to the American people, "The supreme test of the Nation has come. We must all speak and act and serve together."

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FREEMAN].

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding all that has been said in behalf of this bill, I am still of the opinion that since the passage of the war resolution on the 5th of April the sole all-important, vital test to be applied to every war measure is, Will its passage the better fit us to aid our allies and overcome our enemies? Applying that test to the pending bill, I am constrained to follow the trained professional judgment of the War College and the General Staff rather than the untrained amateur judgment of the majority members of the Committee on Military Affairs. If this be acting like a rubber stamp, make the most of it. Prior to the passage of the war resolution it was the right and privilege of every Member of Congress to exercise his individual judgment as to whether or not by any vote of his war could be honorably avoided. I have respect for the man who follows that well-known advice, "Beware of entrance to a quarrel." I lack respect for the man who ignores the balance of it, "but being in, bear't that those opposed may beware of thee."

This Sixty-fifth Congress was called together in extraordinary session, the exact situation was placed before us, and to us was given the choice of submission or resistance to the unlawful acts of Germany. With the patriotic words of the President ringing in our ears and echoing in our hearts—"There is one choice we can not make, we are incapable of making, we will not choose the path of submission"—this House decided upon the course of resistance by an overwhelming majority.

The question now presented is: Shall we conduct this fight standing up or lying down? As our Commander in Chief, the President has asked us, "To take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war." In denying now to him the Army bill he seeks, the bill his military advisers deem absolutely necessary, are we dedicating "our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have" to the duty that we have undertaken? Great armies of men and vast sums of money will be needed in order that this war may be ended and peace be restored. We have voted the money and we intend to enforce its collection. We might have secured this money by asking voluntary contributions to the war funds, and in time, perhaps, the generous might have responded in sufficient amounts. We wisely took no such chances. We might raise the necessary men by voluntary enlistment, and in time the brave and patriotic might respond in sufficient numbers. But the war is already on, our allies need and are entitled to our help, and no time should now be wasted in doubtful uncertain experiments. The adoption of the policy of conscription by this Congress will assure our military leaders that they have behind them and their military plans the full power and strength of the American Republic. I labor under no illusions as to where our armed forces may be sent. I believe that we will fight this war like men and that our armies, when trained and ready, will be sent where, in the judgment of the General Staff, they may strike the hardest, most effective blows for the restoration and preservation of those American rights which by the Imperial German Government have been ruthlessly and brutally violated.

If any troops go abroad in all probability the Regular Army and the National Guard will be the first to go; and I say to you that it is not right; it is not fair or just to send a single American abroad, a Regular, a National Guardsman, or a Volunteer—not even Col. Roosevelt himself—or anyone else without the knowledge that every other able-bodied man of military age will be compelled to do his bit to sustain that American soldier with food, to equip him with munitions, and to reinforce and relieve him on the firing line and in the field and trenches. Only by the adoption of conscription can this be absolutely assured. If we go at all we should go in force. The more that go the easier will be the task of each individual, the less will be the risk of defeat, and the more speedy and certain the restoration of peace through victory. It has been truly said that God is on the side of the heaviest battalions, and that battles are won by having the greatest number of men on the right spot in the quickest possible time. I have grave doubts of the success of the volunteer system. In this peace-loving commercial age of ours there is altogether too much of the spirit of "Let George do it." In the course of debate it has been said the Volunteers did not fail in 1776, in 1812, in 1861, in 1898. Far be it from me to say anything that would reflect upon their glorious deeds. To them we owe our independence and the integrity of the National Union. Let me say, however, that Gen. Washington pleaded with the Continental Congress time and again for a continuous supply of trained men and for the adoption of a "uni-

form and well-digested" military policy. Of the militia that was raised from the several Colonies as occasion seemed to require, he said:

If I were required under oath to say whether they were the greater help or hindrance, I should be obliged to say the latter.

In the War of 1812, except upon the sea, there was very little of which to be proud and much to regret. We suffered an unbroken series of humiliations on land because of our untrained militia. Outnumbering the British 2 to 1, we abandoned and surrendered this beautiful city of Washington to the enemy with a total loss of but 12 men. If the North in the beginning of 1861 had had the policy of universal service that war would have been shortened years, thousands of lives spared, and millions of money saved.

In 1898 I recall my own personal experience under the voluntary system. The official United States record shows that Company I of the Third Connecticut mustered into the service of the United States 106 strong. The real facts are these: In May of 1898 we were a company of the maximum peace strength, 68 in all. When the call came in June we marched down the street 26 in number, of whom 9 were recruits enlisted between the day of the call and the day of entrainment; so that out of the original 68, 17 volunteered and 51 stayed at home. The 51 who stayed at home were brave enough, but they considered that there was no necessity for them to go into the United States Volunteer Army. I think it significant indeed that the volunteers of '98 now stand for conscription. [Applause.]

The burden of the national defense in time of war should not be shifted from the shoulders of the many to the shoulders of the patriotic few. Military service in time of war is the highest, greatest duty that every man owes to his country, and every man should pay and perform that duty in whatever manner or capacity the Nation may decide. The military advisors of the President have asked for selected conscription because, in their judgment, this policy will bring together the best and largest number of armed men in the quickest possible time with the least disturbance to our industrial and agricultural systems. The pending bill makes subject to selective draft all men between the ages of 21 and 40 years. I keenly realize that this power of selection is capable of being abused in its administration, but I do not believe that those charged with the enforcement of its provisions will take any advantage or play any favorites. I feel that to exempt at once arbitrarily, without examination, all those between the ages of 25 and 40 would be a grave mistake; but in time of war great power must be given in the trust that it will be wisely and properly exercised. I do know this, however, that a law of conscription is a solemn duty that we owe to the mothers and sisters of those now in the Regular Army and National Guard, many of whom will be between the ages of 18 and 21, in order that they may know that their boys will not be called upon to make all the sacrifices and that every other able-bodied American will be made ready to come to the assistance of their boys should the occasion ever require. To this end and purpose I favor the minority report. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my good friend from Boston, Mr. GALLIVAN, in his speech of yesterday, said that he had heard that many Members of Congress had not seen the ocean.

I am convinced from what I have heard upon the floor of this House since the debate on this bill began that there are some Members of this House who have not heard that the United States has declared war against Germany.

Some Members of this House do not seem to know what war means or what war is.

I would like to state, for the benefit of those, that war is where people get hurt; where they get killed, maimed, disfigured, and sometimes lose their sight, hearing, or some of their limbs.

If any Member of this House thought when we declared war against the greatest military power in the world that we were going to have a lawn fête or a tea party he was seriously mistaken.

If Germany was not now having her attentions directed in other ways we would know what war meant, for German soldiers would now be on our soil. And we could not stop it.

It is no time now to discuss the beauties of the volunteer system or the hardships of the draft system of raising an army.

We have to have an army, and we have to have it quick.

If I was sick, I would consult a doctor.

If I needed legal advice, I would consult a lawyer.

If my soul was troubled, I would see a minister.

If I needed military advice, I would consult a soldier and not a politician.

I presume that the President of the United States consulted expert military advice, and that when he speaks he speaks from the knowledge he has received from that source.

I do not know much of anything about armies or the organization of armies, and as a Member of this House I am going to do what I can to assist in the winning of this war; and the best thing I can do, and the best thing all the Members of this House can do, is to follow our leader, our Commander in Chief, our President. [Applause.]

The German follows the Kaiser; the Frenchman follows his President; in England they have not much confidence in the King, so Lloyd-George acts as leader.

I want to say to those Democrats who are opposing the President now that they were mighty glad to be following him to victory last fall and will be awful glad to follow him again in 1918. He is the biggest man in your party to-day. Take Woodrow Wilson out of the Democratic Party and it would cease to exist.

If you do not have confidence in him as a leader, then select some one else. [Applause on the Republican side.] We must have a leader in this war.

If I were to select some one else, I know of but one man in the United States who would make a better leader than the President, and that is Col. Roosevelt.

And, by the way, I might say that it is my opinion that a volunteer soldier is better than a conscripted one. I believe that 100,000 volunteers under Col. Roosevelt would be better than half a million conscripted men under some leader they did not know. But that is not a question for me to answer. I am asked what is my duty now under the present conditions. Am I to set up my opinion against the opinion of my leader in this war, the President of the United States?

There is no excuse on earth for a Democratic Member of this House not following the President. If it were not for the President, half of you would not be Members of Congress now.

Next year every man now opposing him in this crisis will be out on the stump telling what a great President he is and how he stood up for American rights.

If there is to be any faultfinding with the President, it should come from the Republican side, not the Democratic side.

For instance, I believe that if the President had stood for the rights of American citizens in Mexico we would not now be at war with Germany.

I believe if the President had been firm for American rights and Germany really knew that he would enforce them she would not have violated them.

I believe that the War Department will not permit Col. Roosevelt to organize an army, because they fear him politically.

There are a great many things that the President has done that I would not have done, and there are many things he has left undone that I would have done.

But I am not going to complain now. The people have selected him as their leader.

I dislike the word "conscription" as much as any Member of this House. I dislike to feel that it is necessary to resort to conscription, but we must remember that this is not a very popular war and that it is harder to get volunteers now than it would have been three years ago. People have been reading of the horrors of war, and they hesitate not only to enlist but to permit their boys to enlist.

I disliked to vote for a \$7,000,000,000 bond issue.

I disliked to vote for the declaration of war, but I felt that the position taken by the President in our international relations made such a declaration necessary.

I dislike to see our brave boys fill the trenches of France and hope they may never have to go to Europe.

I would rather the President would have confined the enforcement of our rights to those upon the sea.

I dislike this alliance with England, France, and Russia and their allies.

But it was not of my choosing.

We are now at war, and the only way we can win that war is by following our leader and doing as he thinks best, surrounded as he is by the best military experts in the world.

It is no time for arguing, for debating, for hesitating; that hour is past. The hour for action is here.

This country can not win this war without a proper leader, and the only thing for Congress and the country to do is to stand by the leader.

I am not going to vote for this conscription because I like it, but because in this emergency I am going to take the advice of the Commander in Chief.

Throughout this war I shall follow the advice and suggestions of the President, because I know that he is better informed than I am and because he has better opportunities to learn what is the best policy for the country to pursue.

It is no time to argue with the commander when the enemy is here.

It is no time to tie the hands of the President when war is declared.

It is no time to hesitate about ways to be pursued in this war, for some one must have his way.

If I am to choose between my own judgment and the judgment of the President in this crisis, I shall take his judgment, for he is in a much better position to know what to do than I am.

The sooner we stop useless talk and accept the President as our leader and commander the sooner the war will be over and the fewer lives will be sacrificed.

Mr. HILLIARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HILLIARD. If war is declared, then, do you see any reason for Congress at all?

Mr. EMERSON. Congress exercises its legal function. But that is all farce. That is a child's question. We have got to have a leader. We have got to have a commander in chief. It is just as some one said here the other day, you might march a regiment out in front of the enemy, and before you ordered it to fight have a referendum to decide whether it should fight or not. It is just as nonsensical as the question asked.

Mr. HILLIARD. You do not think the Constitution has anything to do with it?

Mr. EMERSON. That is all nonsense. I wish the gentleman would not ask nonsensical questions.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. You talk about standing behind the President. Do you propose to vote for any measure the President will offer here?

Mr. EMERSON. That is a child's question.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. How far are you going?

Mr. EMERSON. That is a child's question. I believe the President of the United States has brains enough to act in this crisis. I opposed him last fall as vigorously as you defended him. I believe he has brains and intelligence enough in this crisis to lead this country. I might select somebody else if I had the selection, but he is the leader. But while he is leader I shall stand behind him. [Applause.]

A member of this House who stands here and says he is standing by the President, when he is opposing suggestions made by the President in the conduct of this war is either jolly himself or has a wonderful imagination.

It seems strange to see the Republican ranking member of this committee [Mr. KAHN] fighting for the President's policies and the Democratic chairman fighting against them, but that is what we must expect.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Does not the gentleman know that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], the ranking Republican member of the committee, is not supporting the bill drafted by the President but is only criticizing one feature of the bill that the majority reported in?

Mr. EMERSON. I do not think that is a material question. It is an academic one. He is standing by the President better than you are. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? Will you define an academic question?

Mr. EMERSON. A child's question.

Mr. HILLIARD. And which a philosopher can not answer.

Mr. EMERSON. The Republicans will finally have to do all the fighting and will finally have to pay all the expenses of the war. So, it is not unusual to find the Republicans on the Military Affairs Committee standing by the President and the Democratic members opposing.

I sort of agree with the Democratic members. This war should be managed by the Republicans anyway.

Some members of the Military Affairs Committee on the Democratic side are worried because some one might get killed in this war. They throw up their hands in holy horror because some one may get hurt in this war. If I understand what war is, why, war means fight, and fight means some one gets hurt, and some one must do the fighting. The question is, Who shall do the fighting? I believe the President knows best how to conserve the resources of the United States. I believe the President knows best how to conserve our agricultural resources, how to conserve our manufactured resources, and how to conserve our resources of men.

I believe the President knows what is best for this country to do in this crisis, and I shall follow him as a leader.

If we are all to run the war, we might as well prepare to pay a subsidy to Germany now, for we are licked.

If every time the President asks us to do something or to pass some legislation we are to talk and argue and refuse and hold him up, we are defeated now. The sooner we get down to serious business the better it is for us and the better it will be for our country.

I can epitomize all I have said by saying, "Stand by the President." [Applause.] The question is, Who shall do the fighting?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is it your judgment that the conscripts—these skulkers and slackers that you propose to get by this system that you are favoring—will fight better than the volunteers? Is that the reason you favor the conscription plan?

Mr. EMERSON. No. I said that one volunteer was as good as two conscripts.

Mr. GORDON. Why do you not favor giving us the volunteers, then?

Mr. EMERSON. I will tell you why. I do not believe you can raise half a million men as volunteers in this country to be sent abroad, and neither do you. This is no baby war. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. But you voted for it, did you not?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes; I voted for it, because the President had taken a position before the convening of Congress in extra session that we could not have withdrawn from without dishonor to the country.

Mr. GORDON. You support the President in the war for the reason that you are in favor of this minority report—because the President wanted you to be?

Mr. EMERSON. That is it exactly; because you have got to have a leader and a commander in chief. If Members of Congress were running this war, we know how it would be run. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have more time. I want to ask him a question.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not care to have more time.

Mr. GORDON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. You say that one volunteer is worth two conscripts?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes; that is my opinion, although I may be wrong.

Mr. GORDON. And your opinion also is that no one will volunteer?

Mr. EMERSON. I did not say that. I said I do not think you can raise an army of half a million men to go to Europe by the volunteer system.

Mr. GORDON. That is simply your opinion?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes; that is my opinion.

Mr. GORDON. The majority report provides that if they shall call for volunteers and give those who desire an opportunity to enlist and fail to raise the necessary number and the President finds they can not be raised by volunteer enlistment, he may by an order put this conscription into effect. That would not delay the proceedings, would it?

Mr. EMERSON. That is putting it up to the President.

Mr. GORDON. That is what you are doing.

Mr. EMERSON. No. He puts it up to me.

Mr. GORDON. Do you think the President is competent to decide whether these men can be raised by volunteer enlistment?

Mr. EMERSON. That is not the question. He is the President of the United States, elected by the people.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, yes.

Mr. EMERSON. And if you are going to conduct a successful war and let every Tom, Dick, and Harry here in the House of Representatives suggest the manner in which the war should be carried on, you might as well get ready to pay a subsidy to Germany to-day.

Mr. GORDON. I am not opposed to the war, but the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and not of Congress.

Mr. EMERSON. Oh, that is no man's question. That is a boy's question. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, as I am a new Member of this House and have only 15 minutes, I would not like to be interrupted. I have no prepared speech. I simply have an idea here and there, gathered from the debate of the last three days. I stand for a selective draft.

This is a solemn moment in the history of this Nation. It was a solemn moment to me when I sat on the floor of this House for the first time and heard from the Speaker's desk the magnificent message of the President of the United States, which all of us applauded, and heard him say to you and me what war meant to us if we voted a declaration of war. The President said in unmistakable terms this:

War will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided by law in case of war at least 500,000 men, who should, in my judgment, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training.

It was a solemn moment to me, Mr. Chairman, when in the early hours, the gray hours of the morning, after a long debate in this House we voted almost unanimously a declaration of war, and in that declaration we said in unmistakable terms also that we would, as the Congress of this United States, pledge to the President "all the resources of the country."

Did we mean it? We pledged to the President all the resources of the country, and it seems to me it comes with ill grace from any Member who voted that declaration of war to say to-day that he is going to keep back a part of the price. [Applause.]

What are the resources of this country? Its most precious resources are its citizen soldiers from the age of 21 to 40. Are we going to keep back part of them? Are we going to say to the President, "Of these resources you can have only those that volunteer"? Are you going to say, "We thought the President was going to issue a call for those who could go or stay, just as they pleased"?

Some one has said that only 1 out of 10 would enlist voluntarily. Under selective conscription the 10 are at the call of the President. Which are we going to take? Why, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, with all deference to the older Members of this body, that only here in Congress is there much of a difference of opinion as to what we should do. Among our constituents, out in our great beloved Nation everywhere, people are standing by the President for this conscription, this draft, and not for volunteers. The legislatures that have met since this message came before the country without an exception have stood by the President.

The legislature of my own State on March 8 declared by every vote in that legislature to stand by the President for conscription. The action of Maine was followed by the Legislature of New Jersey on March 19, by the Legislature of Rhode Island March 20, by the Legislature of New Hampshire March 22, by Massachusetts March 29, Connecticut March 30, Minnesota April 3, and of Texas April 23. Every legislature that has had the opportunity to vote has stood by the President. All the governors of the States, with one exception, stand with the President to-day. The Daughters of the American Revolution, speaking for the women of the land, the other day in this great city declared unanimously to stand by the President. The presidents and the educators of our colleges in the Nation are all with the President.

Three hundred and eighty-three mayors of cities in our land of over 5,000 inhabitants are with the President to-day. The Boston Transcript, the most reliable newspaper in this country, conservative and independent, says that 93 per cent of the press of the country is with the President and for conscription. You may make a little light of the press of the Nation, but I say to you that this Congress ought to pay some attention to the great press of this country.

The British Cabinet are for conscription, the French Cabinet are for conscription, the American Cabinet are for conscription. Every military man whose opinion can be obtained stands to-day with the President for conscription.

Among the great former Secretaries of War is Henry L. Stimson of New York. He said the other day;

From the standpoint of our military history there is no more clearly established fact than the failure of the volunteer system. The United States have not yet warred with a first-class power free to devote its entire attention to them. Nevertheless, in our wars the system has regularly broken down. The leading States of Massachusetts and Virginia were forced to resort to the draft by 1777, or only two years after the opening of the Revolution. During the course of that war, in spite of such sporadic efforts by different States, the patriot armies shrunk in number from 89,000 in 1776 to 29,000 in 1781, and our cause was only saved from failure by the timely intervention of the French fleet and army. In 1812 the volunteer system broke down in so many and varied ways as to make that war the most conspicuous example in our history of how not to carry on military operations. During the Civil War both sides were forced to use the draft—the South within a year and the North shortly thereafter. Even in our little War with Spain the full quota of volunteers called for by the President was never obtained. The failure last summer of recruits to appear when called for by the President to meet a national emergency, although over 1,000,000 citizens were parading and shouting themselves hoarse for preparedness, is merely the latest incident of what has been a practically unbroken record in our history.

Gen. Leonard Wood, our greatest military commander to-day, said, April 17:

A voluntary service, however delightful in theory, is ridiculous in practice. It would be a noble thing if every man rushed to the colors, but every man doesn't. The universal system treats all alike—rich or poor, native born or newcomer. So get behind the administration and you'll get rid of a lot of loose talk about war. Only 6,000 men have been enlisted in two weeks, and I leave it to you to estimate how long it will take to get an army of 1,000,000 men. Many men are willing, but they are not willing to do the work of "slackers." Compulsory service will cut out the "slackers"; so get into the fight and make up your minds that so long as there is a sun in Heaven you will never be caught in this fix again.

In this Nation we have 20,000,000 men between 21 and 40 for military service. Out of these under the selective-draft bill you select what you want. Under the volunteer bill men can come or stay at home just as they please. I believe that this Congress should vote to stand by the President of the United States, stand by the War Department, stand by the experience of the world in this matter, and give to the President all the power he needs. If you do that, what will happen? We will take our place once more among the great nations of the world. Then there will come to us all the power we need. Out of the 20,000,000 men from whom to select we will obtain an Army that will go from victory to victory; they will be selected—

From northern forest, from the sun-kissed shore
Of dreamy southland, from the western plain,
From city, town, and hamlet, as of yore,
The answer sounds, "We come—we come—again,
The kin of all who made our country free,
To light the world, the sons of blue and gray,
With all we have and are and wish to be.
Our country calls; we come, we come to-day
To man the ships that strain their leashes taut,
Impatient for the word to cross the wave
Where Jones and Farragut and Dewey fought,
To send the hidden death to hidden grave,
To fill the ranks, to answer every call
To do or die where'er the flag may lead.
Another million, if a million fall,
And freemen all—ten million if you need!
To show to other men that we are men,
Willing to meet our God in death's mad dance,
To bear the starry flag, unsold, again
Unshamed beside the starry soul of France,"
Of England, roused and grim, our motherland,
With hand unswerving on the furrowing plow,
No backward look, no trembling of the hand?
(We ne'er were prouder of our birth than now.)
Of Russia, born anew and stretching hands
Across the sea in freedom's brotherhood?
Of Italy, who left her sunny lands
To fight through snow and avalanche and flood?
Of bleeding Belgium, nursing still the spark
Of sacred fire in her stricken breast?
Swift must our answer be to war's alarms.
Our place is in the van upon the long
Red battle line, where valor, cleaned by fires,
Beckons all free men. There with flag unfurled
We'll show the world we're worthy of our sires
Until we blot forever from the world
This hideous foe of light. The night is o'er!
Our path is straight and shining is the goal!
Awake! America, from shore to shore,
And look not back! Thank God, we've found our soul!

[Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRAUS].

Mr. KRAUS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the public at least understand that the ethics of the House expect new Members to observe, for a season, certain reserve and self-restraint, and I confess a diffidence I feel in attempting to address you would in itself impose modesty in keeping with the rule.

But the new membership of this body represents 20,000,000 of our people, and the questions involved in the pending bill are so momentous and their correct solution will have such a far-reaching influence on the future development of the spiritual and physical life and well-being of our people, and the perpetuity of our national existence, that I am impelled to say a few words on the subject and give the reasons I have already assigned as my justification.

I am convinced that the volunteer method should be adopted in recruiting the armed forces we are seeking to enlist at this time to carry on the war. That this method should be our practice until it is apparent that an insufficient number of men are coming forward to carry on the war. In spite of all that is being put forward under the guise of reason to justify "conscription," a real scrutiny of our military history, a search for the profound lessons it has to teach us, a due regard for the love of country which we are all mightily interested in maintaining and bequeathing to posterity as a priceless gift of our day, the future progressive growth of our democracy and the desire to have the ideals and aspirations of free government dominate the civilized world all point to the one irresistible conclusion that we should perpetuate the volunteer system until there is at least some slight indication that the method might be found inadequate. I submit that neither during the present war nor in any of our wars in the past was the volunteer system found unsuitable for the purposes sought to be accomplished. Whatever weaknesses may have existed in our armed forces are not properly chargeable to this method of recruiting. The other and real reasons are readily discernible if we will not blindly close our eyes.

Every shot that was fired in the cause of liberty and for the right of representation at Lexington and Concord came from the musket of a volunteer. The weaknesses that became apparent in the subsequent period of that initial campaign of the American Revolution can not be laid at the door of the patriotic spirit that prompted our forefathers to take up arms; the volunteer method of enlistment never has been, nor will it at any time, be found to be responsible for the lack of arms and supplies, nor for the absence of an opportunity to train and be trained in military maneuvers and tactics, while conscription at once destroys the ideals and enervates the spirit of the freemen who should and will under our democracy protect its life and institutions. I will not be counted among those who, in advocating the "draft," impliedly admit that there is such a lack of national motive in our present war that we must resort to "conscription" in order that we may secure the man power necessary to defend our shores and bring to fruition our aims and aspirations in this contest.

During the War of the Rebellion the number of volunteers under arms prior to the institution of the draft was somewhat in excess of 600,000, and thereafter almost 1,370,000 men were enlisted, but the fact is recorded in our history that, notwithstanding the existence of the conscription act, more than 1,000,000 of the men recruited while it was on the statute books were volunteers, and, at that, less than 3 per cent of the total number of men recruited for the Army in this war were personally drafted. The history of recruiting during this period of the existence of the Republic is in itself a refutation of every pretended argument that is being put forth in advocacy of conscription. [Applause.]

I am convinced that what little sentiment there is among the masses of our people against this measure is based upon a misconception that is being given vitality by the propaganda exploiting conscription in the press. Before the declaration of war there was, and still is, a widespread belief in a system of universal military training which would, in the opinion of its advocates, be efficacious in preventing us from either entering into war for purposes of aggression, and in the event we were wantonly attacked it would be an effective instrumentality of defense. The propagandists are seeking to create the impression that such a system of universal training and conscription to meet the present situation are one and the same.

There is no basis for such an assertion or assumption, and it can not be shown more clearly than in the statement of Secretary of War Baker, in the official report of the hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, on April 7, 1917, but the pronounced belief in a universal system of military training is being used to secure favor for conscription. I want to assert that in raising an army, either by volunteering or by conscription, neither plan has an advantage over the other in regard to the military qualifications of the personnel of the proposed armies. Under either system the army would stand on an equal footing in being composed of civilians to be developed into soldiers, but certainly the volunteer system would have the advantage of being composed of patriotic men who enlisted with the highest motives and the single thought of serving their country, which would certainly give it a forcefulness and strength of character above one composed of conscripted men. I sincerely believe in a volunteer system, also, because, in accordance with the ideals we have sought to develop and inculcate in almost a century and a half of national life, a conscript is without honor, and this stigma would doubtless attach to men of splendid character who would be compelled to enter service by a conscriptive measure.

True, it is argued by the advocates of selective conscription, that patriotic men may even now volunteer in the Regular Army, but as that Army to this time has been composed of scattered units, who have not been impelled by the patriotism that comes with national danger to sever home ties, surrender personal opportunities and sacrifice their aspirations, and who have enlisted when war was only a remote possibility, the distinctive honor of volunteering for this war would be lost to such as enlisted in the Regular Army, and, furthermore, would not be as congenial and inspiring as enlisting in a company and regiment from their own towns and communities, by which local enlistment they would hope to bring honor to their communities.

The element of the press that is advocating conscription is laying great emphasis on the selective idea as a feature of the proposed military establishment. Every word that has been written, and every syllable that may be uttered in favor of the purposes expressed by this word, as used in this legislation, is applicable to both the volunteer and conscriptive systems created by the law we have under consideration. For even a casual examination of the bill before us will disclose that the selective principle is made equally a part of both the volunteer and conscriptive systems and in any event should be retained in principle in the new organization that will be established by its provisions. Further, the proposed volunteer method has the advantage of affording the means of supplying the men required for our armed forces at a much earlier day than the conscriptive system. It can be made to operate and it is the expectation of its advocates that it will be in operation during the four months' period that it is conceded will be required as the registration period under the conscription system. In other words, during the four months following the enactment of this law not a single conscript will be enrolled, but the volunteer method will be bringing hundreds of thousands of loyal patriotic Americans to the colors. When registration, which is an essential step under the conscriptive system, is an accomplished fact, if the volunteer system is supplying an insufficient number of men of the right quality, its operation can be at once terminated, and the right to conscript becomes by this very bill a power of the Government. Gentlemen, I submit to you in all candor, which system will care for the immediate national requirements? Can any valid reason be advanced why we should forego this advantage of enrolling immediately the thousands of men who can only be obtained by the volunteer system proposed in this bill and before the conscriptive method can become operative?

The argument that selective conscription would reach the sons of rich men that otherwise might escape service is, I believe, without justification, and is probably used by some to arouse prejudice in support of the conscriptive proposition. In our own war and in the present war in England it has been clearly demonstrated that this class has presented itself early for enlistment, and has suffered to at least as great an extent as any of the other elements in the country. [Applause.] Let us be frank and appeal to no prejudice. Patriotism is not the exclusive heritage of either the rich or the poor; it is a quality of mind and heart common to our people in all positions in life.

Let us look at a more recent example of the workings of the voluntary system. At the outbreak of the Spanish-American War there was such a wave of patriotism and demand on the military authorities for permission to enlist that there was much ill feeling and disappointment among thousands who were turned away. I may say, modestly, that with a whole company of boys who resided in my home community I was of this number, and I know of thousands of men in Indiana who made earnest efforts to enlist and were denied the privilege. Would anyone assert on the floor of this House that our citizens are not as loyal to-day, and when called would not answer as promptly and heartily now, as at that time? I am disposed to resent the implication which the conscriptive measure would awaken, that loyalty is so dead with us, as a people, that force must be employed to obtain an army at the beginning of this war. Are we not, as a people, as loyal as the Canadians, Australians, and English? The first two named countries have not to this day resorted to conscription, and Canada, with a population of but 8,000,000, has raised a volunteer army of 400,000 men; Australia, with a population of 5,000,000, has enlisted an army, without compulsion, of over 260,000; and Great Britain, with a population of 41,000,000, recruited a volunteer force of 5,000,000 men, and only resorted to conscription two years after the war began. Compulsion has not as yet been adopted in Ireland, but Erin has furnished more recruits in proportion to population than any part of the United Kingdom. No one would seriously contend that the expeditionary army which England sent to French soil in the early days of the

struggle was weak because of the method by which it was recruited. It was weak only because its numbers were small compared with the forces they were compelled to meet. English military weakness in the early days of the war can not justly be made a count against the volunteer method of enlistment, but was in fact the weakness that is inherent in any system that embodies no policy of military training and education for youth, together with practically a total absence of a marshaling of the industrial and productive resources of the country for equipping and maintaining a large armed force on a war footing.

Every man in our Regular Army, from the private to the highest staff or line officer, is a volunteer, and is there a man within the hearing of my voice who believes or would assert that it is not as efficient in proportion to its numerical strength as we have a right to demand and expect, merely because each human being in it of his own free will sought membership in its various units?

Are not our hundred million people as loyal to our country as the people of the United Kingdom are to their Government? Has anyone the temerity to claim that the volunteer system will not bring to the colors as many men as can be used under the provisions of this bill in less time than our Government can prepare to train and care for them? [Applause.]

No doubt conscription will and should come, but we can not afford to have it adopted at the inception of this war. Do not put the brand of "conscript" on the patriotic young men of the Nation. I implore you do not put this system on the loyal men of Indiana. I know that the adjutant general of my State, under the direction of our governor, at the first breath of war, permitted the organization of companies and regiments to be started by volunteers, but recruiting was discontinued at the first suggestion of "the draft." I can assure you, my colleagues, that if you will but remove the ban imposed by the proposed conscription, Indiana will furnish her quota of the army it is proposed to recruit by this bill as soon as the mustering officers can reach the State. Every man will be animated by such love of country, ready to forego the pursuits of civil life in the protection and upholding of his country's cause, that we will have the army of a real democracy—an army imbued with the ideals that are basic in our Government, believing in the righteousness and justness of our cause, and worthy of battling to uphold and maintain the honor, aims, and aspirations of a free people. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKENZIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have a certain amount that I want to say on this subject, and a limited time in which to say it, I hope I may proceed without interruption.

Mr. Chairman, on the 5th day of April last this House, by a vote of 373 to 50, recognized the existence of a state of war with Germany and stated that "to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States." This resolution, having had the approval of both Houses of this Congress and the Chief Executive, is to-day the voice of the American people expressed in the only way our people can speak.

Having in this solemn manner pledged our resources, we are setting about to try to make our actions harmonize with our words. We have recognized a state of war with the strongest military power on earth, a people who, under the guidance of the Bismarckian theory of "blood and iron," for 40 years have been perfecting a military system that has to-day evolved the greatest military machine known in the history of the world. If it were not such a mighty fighting machine it would long since have been destroyed by the efforts that have been made to wreck it. The world sees for the first time a nation of 70,000,000 people completely mobilized for war. We have deliberately taken up the gage of battle that the Government of this nation has thrown down. In so doing we justify our action on the theory that we are forced to do this in defense of the rights and liberties of our people and in the holy cause of humanity and justice. We contend that we have exhausted every resource of arbitration and diplomacy and solemnly assert to the world that this thing we do we do because there is no other alternative, and lest if we do not now and here take up the sword our people now and in generations to come will suffer the loss of some of their essential liberties. We say also that there is abroad a disturber of the peace of the nations that it is our duty to help to suppress. Avowing these laudable and elevating motives for our actions, we have departed from our peaceful vocations and appealed to the God of our fathers for victory to our arms. Our declaration has also arrayed or will array against us the armies of three other nations.

It seems to me that in consideration of this matter we ought to take such steps as would enable us to cope with our antagonists, without regard to those who may be fighting side by side with us. We have no allies, so called. We should exercise the greatest care to avoid entangling alliances that would for all time ensnare us in the international maze of Europe and Asia. We should not enter such compacts that we can not easily recede therefrom at the close of the war. I am in favor of taking any advantage that may be of the fact that other nations are also fighting our antagonists. But this is our war. We went into it because we had a just cause. We will wage this war until that cause be removed and we be secured in all our rights as a free people. When we have fought our war and attained our purposes, in my judgment, we are done. Of course, a decent regard for the safety of our friends, who have fought side by side with us, and the continuing peace of the world may require us to continue the struggle for a time even after our own objects are attained. Therefore we ought to, in a measure, disregard the conditions that exist as to other nations and measure our own strength with that of our antagonists. Conditions may quickly arise that will throw us on our own resources. If the new Government of Russia quickly makes peace with the central powers, the conditions on the west front might be so changed that peace would be forced on the entente powers unless they received immediate and substantial help from us. We can not expect some one else to fight our battles for us. This is not an imitation war. Conditions may arise where it will require every ounce of energy we have as a people to protect ourselves, irrespective of waging an aggressive war against an enemy 3,000 miles away. We should not expect to declare war and calmly sit down and take our time to it. Wars will not conduct themselves.

The President of the United States has been intrusted by our people with high power in this emergency. He and his advisers have means and facilities for gathering information as to the conditions, information that is not available, in large part, to this body and to the people. We are not well and intimately advised of the exact economic, financial, and physical conditions of the nations at war with Europe. The President is. We act according to our lights only. He acts with those lights and many others. He has no doubt given the matters now in consideration by this House deep thought. As a result of this, he recommends to the Congress a course of action as to the raising of an army and solemnly states that, in his judgment, to adopt any other might end in inefficiency and disaster. Unless I know some good reason to the contrary I am willing to accept his judgment.

In this Nation we have three great resources: Money, men, and food. If we are wise we will conserve all three in any way possible. We must not lose sight of the fact that war is but a transitory diversion of our national life, but that when peace is again resumed our principal business in life recommences. For the period of the war I believe I am right in saying that this people ought to bend all its energies to carrying on the war for three reasons: First, to end the war successfully. Second, to end the war quickly. Third, to conserve our resources in every possible way.

During the period of this war, for general efficiency, profit making should cease. If the war is worth making, then it follows that the war should be waged as nearly on a cost basis as is possible. If there is any one thing the American people ought to do it is to see that some fortunate class or classes of our people are not allowed to fatten at the expense of those who patriotically are bearing the burdens of the war. In the making of munitions the owner and the laborer should alike contribute, the one from his labor and the other from his capital, to the common defense and welfare. The cost of living, now mounting sky high, largely as a result of speculation, ought to be controlled and regulated by the most stringent and far-reaching legislation during this emergency. This war, undertaken in what we protest to be a holy cause, must not be the occasion of the rich growing richer and the poor growing poorer. Let us fight our fight side by side; let us for a while forget our profits. In this emergency he who seizes the occasion to exact great profits from his factories, he who takes advantage of material wants to compel greater return for his labor, he who seizes the food of the people and demands inordinate profits is just as disloyal as the man who shirks and evades the service in the field or gives assistance to the enemy. [Applause.] And, furthermore, we should so vote on this matter as to minimize, as much as possible, the creation of such unnecessary conditions.

We have, by an almost unanimous vote of this House, contributed an immense sum for the carrying on of the war. We did it freely and willingly, and we will give as much more, if need be.

The greatest question that confronts us now, it seems to me, is how we may best conserve our human resources. We are all agreed that for six months, at least, it will not be possible for us to place any force of any importance on the battle line in France. We are also all agreed that if the allied troops are to carry on the war, and to have any chance of success, we must keep a lane open across the sea and keep them supplied with munitions, and especially with food.

The flow of foodstuffs across the sea has taxed our strength exceedingly during the last year, even when we were at peace. If this food supply stops, the allied nations can not keep the field. In addition to this burden we are now about to raise an army of about 2,000,000 men. These men will be drawn from the ranks of producers, and we immediately will have to feed them. Added to this is a very noticeable failure in crop prospects for the coming year. An inclement season has largely killed the winter wheat in some localities. There is, and has been for many years throughout the great Middle West, the mighty storehouse of the Mississippi Valley, a great scarcity of farm labor. Men have drifted into the cities, attracted by the conditions there, and the farms have been denuded. Examine the census reports and you will find that in the 10 years from 1900 to 1910 the population of many of the rural counties of the West decreased while the urban localities largely increased. Men are getting \$50 a month in my locality for farm labor, and at that you can not get them. The problem of keeping the farms producing is one of most stupendous moment.

I believe in raising this new army we ought to conserve our human resources. We ought to conduct this war with the least expenditure of money, and especially of human life, possible.

I can not see, from all the light I have been able to get on the subject, how we can do this by the adoption of a volunteer system of raising an army. I appreciate the claims that are made by those who point with pride to our record in former wars when our people marched to the colors to defend the land. These are glorious traditions and are calculated to inspire us to patriotic thought and action. Through the smoke of battle, on many a field of glory, the American volunteer has proved himself the peer of any soldier in the world. I consider it my greatest pride of memory that I sprung from the loins of one of the men of '61, who, side by side with his comrades, wore the blue and laughed at pain and saw the bayonet's flash and heard the call to arms. [Applause.]

But, irrespective of this, experience has taught us that many thousands of lives of the best youth of our land have been lost needlessly by disease and inefficiency in our various wars of the past. There are men now here in this House, as I have heard them state, who felt their hearts torn with pity in 1898 when our boys died in the camps of Georgia and Florida. The same thing was true in 1861 and in 1812 and in 1776. The volunteer system is not efficient; it is wasteful of the one thing we ought to conserve above all things, human life. For example, in the War with Spain, in the volunteers, there were 3,729 deaths from disease and 190 killed in action and 78 died of wounds.

Two plans of raising this army are suggested: (1) That it be raised by a volunteer system, if possible, and if not, by selective draft by Executive order; (2) by selective draft. Either system includes the element of selective draft, but in the one Congress says, "let the President do it," and in the other it says, "we will do it ourselves."

If a call is issued for 500,000 volunteers under the act of April 25, 1914, there can be no choice of applicants, except as to physical fitness. I can find nothing in that bill to authorize a selection. Therefore a half million men will indiscriminately come from the country, out of lives of useful production, into the consuming class of the Army.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I stated at the beginning of my remarks that as I had only 20 minutes I preferred not to be interrupted.

I have heard much discussion on the question of the elements of our national life from which these will be recruited. It has been said to me that they will come mostly from the young men and adventurous and nonproducing classes of our people. I do not agree with this. Such is not the case in my country. If you will pardon a personal allusion, in my little town of 2,500 inhabitants we have already sent into the service 120 young men, and they are the cream of the town, students, farmer boys; we are giving the best we have. In 1861 our country was denuded of its best young blood. The same was, in a limited degree, true in 1898. I tell you that in my judgment a call for volunteers will take the best blood of the land, the blood that wisdom and discretion counsel ought to be conserved as much as possible. It ought to bear its share of the burden,

but no more. Our colleges and schools are boiling with patriotic fervor. The young men from the farms are ready and anxious to go, and will go when the call comes. It will be remembered that enlistment in the Regular Army or federalized National Guard does not appeal to the ordinary young man as the trumpet call of the President's call for volunteers would.

Let us be sensible about this matter. Let us conserve our vital forces. A friend of mine, in this House, said to me the other day: "Wars are expensive and have to be paid for, and the only legal tender is blood of brave men." It is true, and we ought at least to make the price as low as possible.

If we permit our young, strong element to go from the forge and the school and the farm indiscriminately, we cripple ourselves in our producing power. It may not appeal to the imagination so much, but the man who follows the plow and makes the earth produce and the man who makes the plowshare in the factory may be worth a hundred soldiers in the field. My district is in what is called the military tract of Illinois, I believe the richest tract of farm land in the world. I know what will happen if the call for volunteers comes—these farmer boys will go at the call of their country, and thousands of acres will not produce the foodstuffs we shall so much need before this coming winter is over. A great Government arsenal is in my district, where men toil night and day to make the things our fighting men need. If the call for volunteers comes, do you not think many of these men will go? The red blood of our fathers is in their veins, and with patriotic zeal they will hear the call of their country. We do not, as has been said, raise our taxes by voluntary subscription. Our institutions secure us the right to trial, when accused of crime, by a jury of our peers. When our time comes, we perform our service on juries by lot, unless we have some reasonable excuse that a fair court will accept. We all ought to bear the burdens of government equally. It might be different if there were in this country a governing class and a serving class. But here, thank God, the people rule. Here we have organized ourselves together and have formed a Government for the single purpose of protecting ourselves in our liberties and rights. Our Government has no other functions. Therefore, as we, the people, are the Government, we must each equally maintain the Government. There is no fair way to do this except by equal contributions of our money and time and service, according to our ability.

We have decided now that the necessary defense of our liberties and rights requires war. War requires time and money and service. The only question now is: What is my fair share of the burden—is it a part of my money or is it my time or my service? By a fair method this should be ascertained, and, whatever it is, we should give.

But it is said that to preserve American traditions we should first try the volunteer system, and if it fails, let the President draft men. I believe men will volunteer if such a call be made, but every farm and industry in the country will be crippled by it, and this we can not afford to do. But if it does fail, and then the draft is used, immediately you create two classes, the volunteer and the slacker who was forced to go. In either case, the experiment has not worked well.

If we start on selective conscription in the beginning, the burdens will rest equally on all of us. By local tribunals, having full knowledge of local conditions, the availability of each selected man may be passed upon and that man be placed where he will do the most good, and if the judgment is that he stay on the farm or in the factory, then the stigma of slacker will not be applied to him. By this means, production will not be crippled, and the farms will yield their golden store; by this means each man will fit in the place where he can do the most good, and the rule of conservation of our human and vital forces will obtain. Any other method is wasteful and ought not to be thought of.

But the greatest result that will follow the adoption of a selective-draft system immediately by this people will be the effect it will produce on our antagonists. Do you not believe that the spectacle of this great Nation girding on its armor and forgetting nothing, the vision of a people of 100,000,000 assembling and mobilizing all its energies in a careful and efficient and thorough manner, will impress those with whom we are to do battle with the intensity of our purposes to pursue our way until victory shall be attained? And when the war is ended, and the world has gone back to its ways of peace, do you not think that the national marauder that next sets about to disturb our national peace will have an indelible memory of a stalwart Nation, terrible when aroused and when its cause is just, of America mighty and America efficient?

I listened with great interest to two wonderful arguments this afternoon, one by the gentleman from Missouri, our re-

spected Speaker, and the other by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. They were addresses such as few of us will ever listen to again. But after I had listened to them I tried to analyze them, and the determination I came to was that one appealed to the sympathy and the other to the reason. And this, I believe, is the reason for the great difference in opinion here. If we go by our sentiments the volunteer system is the system that appeals to our minds, while our reason tells us something else. And I could not help thinking as I listened to the Speaker's wonderful peroration, in which he mentioned his son's intention to give his service to his country, of the days we have seen this young man standing by his father here, intelligent, alert, active, useful, the incarnation of young manhood, that no system ought to be adopted that would permit this young man and 500,000 more of his kind, from patriotic and laudable motives, to go and give their lives on the field of battle, while 500,000 more young, strong men, but lacking in usefulness and appreciation of their duties as American citizens, loaf on the streets or in the barrooms or pool halls and idle away their lives, basking in the light of a freedom secured to them by a volunteer system and the valiant services of brave and patriotic men. [Applause.]

Several points have been made in argument for the majority report. Constant reference is made to the administration bill's limit of 19 to 25 years. There is no such bill before this House, and why waste time discussing it? It has been said no one could know what the exemptions may be if selective draft be authorized. Why not? Section 3 of the bill names the classes exempt. Neither side differ about these. I have heard it said that the President may make unfair regulations and certain districts be discriminated against. In the first place, I do not believe it. I hold no brief for Woodrow Wilson, but I refuse to believe the President of the United States would stoop to such ignoble measures. If any unfair measures were adopted by those in authority, it is a matter of administration of the law for which those responsible will be held to account by the American people at the polls. But you will observe that if the President might do so under the minority bill, he could also do so under the majority bill. Note the provisions of section 3 of the printed bill, page 9, lines 9 to 16. It has been said that the State units should be kept together and the neighborhood idea preserved. This is provided for in the third paragraph of section 1. That no State or Territory can be discriminated against and that each such division must contribute its pro rata part of the burden is amply provided for in the same paragraph.

I am, therefore, constrained to believe that the plan adopted by the majority of the committee is unwise and that the minority plan ought to obtain. I am a Republican, and after about four weeks' experience in this House my faith is to-day stronger than it ever was. I do not believe I agree with a single policy of the Democratic Party announced and followed by it for four years past. I do not agree with Woodrow Wilson in his conduct of international affairs prior to this war. But a majority of the American people did, and this is a country where the majority rules, and so be it. But when the President came to this Congress and asserted the rights of the American people, I enlisted under his banner, and I enlisted until the end of the war. He says now, by implication, that the adoption of any other method than that proposed, the selective draft, would end in confusion. He ought to know about this; he has had the benefit of the best advice from experts and through diplomatic channels and knows whereof he speaks. I have not been so informed. Therefore I have to-day my own reason and the advice of the Chief Executive both pointing out the same path for me to follow, and I shall follow, feeling sure that while I have perhaps not followed an easy path it is the best one my mind's eyes have yet perceived. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, on August 1, 1914, a war broke out across the sea and spread like a conflagration until it enveloped nearly all of Europe. The United States proclaimed its neutrality and did everything possible to keep out of it. For two and one-half years we succeeded. The President, with calm, patient diplomacy unequalled in the history of this country, succeeded in avoiding war. We were encouraged to believe that the end would come to the terrible conflict in the no distant future without our being drawn into it.

As in all wars, neutral rights were violated, and we entered vigorous protests. Lives of our citizens were taken on the high seas without warning, and at first excuses were made and apologies offered. About two years ago the *Lusitania* was sunk without warning, and the civilized world stood aghast. Among the passengers going to a watery grave were 115 American citizens.

A demand was made on the Imperial German Government by the United States to define its policy with reference to the use of submarines, and that Government was then informed if such a policy was to be followed longer it would lead to the severance of diplomatic relations and the holding of that Government to a strict accountability. Everybody applauded the diplomatic victory of the President, and our Government was assured of a discontinuance of the submarine policy of Germany.

This continued until January 31, 1917, when, without previous notice, our Government was warned that the submarine policy of Germany would be renewed again on February 1, 1917, against all vessels within a certain prescribed zone around the British Isles and in the Mediterranean Sea. This led to the severance of our diplomatic relations. There was no other course open for our country to pursue, because Germany had admittedly become an outlaw upon the high seas. The American people still hoped that this would not lead to war and that Germany would not in fact pursue the policy of destroying the lives of neutrals or the sinking of vessels without warning in admitted violation of international law. However, since that time, ship after ship flying alien flags and the flag of the United States has been submarined without warning and 224 Americans have lost their lives. This was murder as much so as if Germany had invaded the United States and killed our citizens on our own soil.

The President called Congress to meet in extra session on April 2, and on April 5 the House passed by an almost unanimous vote a resolution declaring that a state of war existed with Germany. There was no other course to pursue. This Government could not with honor permit the lives of American citizens to be taken in violation of international law. I voted for this resolution.

A war can not be fought simply by making a declaration. There must be men to fight and money to supply food and munitions. On April 14 the House passed an act authorizing the issuance of \$5,000,000,000 in bonds and \$2,000,000,000 in certificates for the purpose of conducting the war to a successful conclusion. I voted for this bill. This bill passed both the House and Senate unanimously. It authorizes the raising and expending of the largest sum of money of any measure passed by any legislative body in the civilized world.

We have voted the declaration of war, we have provided for the raising of this large sum of money and its expenditure, and we have now come to consider the present bill, authorizing the temporary increase of the Military Establishment of the United States.

It is unnecessary to discuss the bill at length. There is a majority and a minority report. The difference between the two reports succinctly stated is as follows: The majority report favors a trial of the volunteer system in enlisting men for the Army, and the minority report favors universal military service and the selective draft. The Military Committee of the Senate has reported in favor of the selective draft. The President favors it, as does the Secretary of War with all his Army officer advisers.

Let us examine the two systems. By the volunteer system an appeal is made to the patriotic men of the country to come forward and enlist for service in the Army. I have no doubt that if such a call were issued and the men of our country were assured of seeing real service, they would respond readily. The selective-draft system, on the other hand, contemplates a registration being taken immediately of men eligible for military service under rules and regulations prescribed by the President. Only men between the ages of 21 and 40 years are liable to military service. By this system all citizens are put upon a plane of absolute equality. Everyone between these ages is liable to military service. Exemptions are provided for men physically unfit, for men whose religious principles are against war, and certain other exemptions in the bill not necessary to enumerate. To my mind this is an absolutely fair method. It makes no distinction because of occupation, wealth, or station in life. It recognizes the principle that every one owes a duty to his Government.

Everybody should serve his Government in this emergency in some way. You can serve it as patriotically by raising food supplies, by working in munition plants, by assisting the transportation facilities of the country, or in thousands of other ways as effectively as you could in the Army.

By the selective method, every citizen could be required to do the work for which he is most fit and which he can do most effectively, where he can serve his Government best.

Discussion for the past two or three days upon the pending bill has taken a very wide range, and, to my mind, much of it has been far afield—wide of the mark. The question is not whether

we shall vote for war. We voted for war April 5 almost unanimously. It is not a question of whether we shall give the war financial support. We unanimously voted \$7,000,000,000 for this purpose on April 14. The question now before us is what is the most effective plan for enlisting men in the Army. What is an absolutely fair plan, the volunteer system or the selective system? We have heard much talk against the enlistment of boys under 21 years of age. That is not in the pending bill. Both reports provide for enlistments of men between the ages of 21 and 40. Why, then, should we discuss it? The only point of difference before the House is, which is the fairer method of enlisting men for the Army? The majority of the committee argue that men who volunteer would be the young, patriotic, liberty-loving sons of our country, who would come to the defense of our national honor and would sacrifice everything in defending the flag; but the question is, Can we consider this a fair method?

We love our Government and its institutions, because it guarantees protection to all alike; and I insist that there is a corresponding military obligation upon every citizen of this country to serve it and to defend its honor. [Applause.] You issue a call under the volunteer system. Public meetings will be held, patriotic speeches will be made, and references will be made to the glory of our past history in order to induce the very flower of our country to volunteer; but this argument will not appeal to many, and the slackers, who are the unproductive citizens at home, will not volunteer and pay a military obligation they owe this Government.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Is it the gentleman's idea that a selective draft will produce more efficient men and at the same time make everybody bear an equal burden?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think so; and if the gentleman will wait patiently until I get through with the argument, I think it will appeal to him.

Under the selective system it is proposed that a registration shall be made of all men between certain ages, exempting from military duty men who are in the service of the Government of the United States, or of any State, and men engaged in industries including agriculture. In short, it would permit the selection of men of military age from those who are less productive and who can best be spared from the civil walks of life.

During the past three days, in the discussion of this bill, no one has pointed out the unfairness of the selective method. Assuming that this is a righteous war, that Congress should have voted for it as it did, and that Congress should appropriate money to sustain it as it did, it is our duty to enact a law which will raise an efficient army speedily. If all who are of military age are required to register and men claiming exemption are passed upon, I submit that it is fair to everyone for the remainder of the names to be drawn from a box or a wheel after the fashion that juries are drawn, up to the number called for. That is equality. That would require everyone to perform his military duty. No one during this debate has shown the unfairness of this method. The debate has run off on side issues.

Attention has frequently been called to the glorious record made by the volunteer armies of this and other countries. No one would pluck a laurel from the brow of any soldier of this country who volunteered in the Revolutionary War or any subsequent war; but because he volunteered and rendered distinguished service did not make it right that he should leave his home and fireside to suffer sacrifices while others owing an equal military obligation, but whose ears were deaf to the patriotic appeals of their country, remained at home. [Applause.] This war may be long. No man in this House can to-day foresee its end. We all hope that it will be terminated before any American boy crosses the sea and is landed upon European soil. [Applause.] About this there is no disagreement. However, that is not the question before us.

We are trying to provide the means for raising an army, and the question that must never be lost sight of is, Which is the fairest method to raise it? If this war continues any considerable length of time, every sort of sacrifice must be made. It is unnecessary to enumerate to those who saw any service in our past wars the great sacrifices that must be made not only by the soldiers in the ranks but by the loving mothers and the fair daughters of our land who will be called upon to make all kinds of personal sacrifices. We must prepare in every way to meet the greatest military nation on earth, and preparation does not mean only the raising of a large army and navy, but that we must provide an abundance of munitions of every kind and character, keeping in mind that we must furnish also our allies who are fighting side by side in a common cause. Not only this, but we must raise food supplies, keep our industries going and

our avenues of transportation open on land and sea. To do this will require large armies of men in civil life. We will require the active, energetic, industrious assistance of every farmer, and everyone who can be induced to go upon the farm to raise food supplies. Shoes and clothing must be manufactured in unusually large quantities, and there will be an increase in every kind of manufactured goods that will tax the maximum capacity of our industries and will require an additional force of trained men in order that foodstuffs, clothing, and munitions may find a continuous flow to the seaboard. An army of men must run the trains of the country. Manifestly, it would not be for the best interests of this Nation to permit men to be taken from these various civil walks of life, where they will serve their country to such a splendid advantage, and permit them to volunteer in an army, and at the same time allow the street loafer, the inhabitant of poolrooms, and the slacker to remain in idleness at home. Oh, so much has been said about the volunteers of the United States, England, Canada, and New Zealand. In 1862 the Southern States had to resort to conscription, and in 1863 the United States Congress passed a conscription act. All these volunteers, whether they served under Jackson and Lee or under Sheridan and Grant, rendered conspicuous service in their respective armies; but the point I want to invite attention to is that in both cases conscription had to be resorted to.

It is stated that the British Parliament never enacted a conscription law until May, 1916, and that some five million men volunteered, and that only about one and one-half million have been enlisted under this law. This does not show any objection to universal military service; but it is also stated that conscription is an odious term. It certainly would be a badge of disgrace if the men of military age were appealed to for two or three years to come to the defense of the flag of their country, and their ears were deaf to the patriotic appeals, and they were finally forced to enlist. If we pass this act, however, so that everyone comes in at the same time and under the same law, no one will have refused upon whom there is a military obligation to come to the defense of his country.

It has been said in debate that men conscripted in the Civil War, both in the North and in the South, did not make the best soldiers. I do not doubt it. Anyone would know it without looking into history. But it must be remembered that the patriotic sons, both North and South, readily joined the colors, and the conscripts were made up from the very dregs of the country. This is true in England. For two years every appeal known to the ingenuity of a patriotic people was made to secure enlistments. Of course, the very flower of the country enlisted, and it left the inferior classes to be conscripted from.

Again, you say that patriotism in the United States is not dead; that we are worthy descendants of noble sires; that we remember Concord, Lexington, Bunker Hill, and Valley Forge, and that our people can be depended upon to respond to our Nation's call. Of course, this is a fine sentiment, but public sentiment in every community throughout this Nation would conscript every brave, patriotic, self-respecting boy in this land, as it has in all past wars.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I am much interested in the very able speech that the gentleman is making. I wondered, however, while I might not agree with him, whether the gentleman believed that under the volunteer system we could raise in Oklahoma all of our apportionment that might be made to us in a short time.

Mr. HASTINGS. In answer to my colleague, I have not the slightest doubt of it. I am arguing that if you make a patriotic appeal to my town, to the patriotic, liberty-loving boys and young men of that community or other towns in our State, they will at once enlist, but those to whom patriotism does not appeal and who do not respond to the obligations of the Government will be left at home among the unproductive class.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Which does the gentleman believe will make the best soldiers—the ones who volunteer or the ones who want to stay at home?

Mr. HASTINGS. I have already stated, if the gentleman had followed my argument, that I thought the patriotic young men would make the best soldiers. I do not believe that that ought, however, to relieve the other young men of the country from their equal obligations to the Government.

Mr. GORDON. If the gentleman will permit, it was said in one of the best speeches on your side that has been made here to-day—by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]—that we ought to forget persons and consider only the interests of the country. If that is true, is not the country entitled to the best it can get?

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not believe that the patriotic boys alone owe obligations to the country. I believe the rich and the poor, the high and the low, all owe the Government obligations; and if the gentleman had listened to me, I will say that they all ought to respond in this emergency to the country's call and come forth rendering their service in defense of the flag of this glorious country. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does the gentleman think we can apply the same rule to the selection of officers, without regard to which one is the best man? Why not require that the men shall be chosen without any regard to fitness for position in order to distribute it?

Mr. HASTINGS. In civil life?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No; the Army officers.

Mr. HASTINGS. Everybody knows that you must have military experience for an officer.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We want the best, do we not?

Mr. HASTINGS. Unquestionably; but we can not apply that to the great body of citizens in civil life, because they have not had military training.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. As I understand the gentleman's argument, there are two classes of soldiers, the patriotic soldier and what the gentleman terms "slackers." Under the selective system you do not expect to use all of both classes, else there would be no selection; you must pick out some from among each, and you say you do not want to take all of the patriotic soldiers and leave slackers at home. Is it the gentleman's idea that you can better bring the war to a speedy conclusion by fighting the battles of the country with slackers? Is it the idea of the conscriptionist that they are going to take the slacker and leave the patriotic boys at home?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think I will answer that before I get through.

Every patriotic boy of my country would feel ashamed of himself, if enlistments were called for and patriotic speeches were made, to remain in the audience and look about him and see his friends and neighbors respond to his country's call and not offer himself to enlist. What about the boy or man to whom patriotism does not appeal, to whom patriotic appeals would fall on deaf ears? The nonproductive, idle citizens would remain at home and render no service to the State or Nation, while the patriotic, productive man would be taken in numbers from the various walks of life and made to defend the honor of his country, fight for the preservation of our institutions and for the Government, which guarantees protection to all alike—the rich and poor, the high and low. I can not escape the conclusion that there is an equal military obligation resting upon every citizen of this Republic, regardless of his station in life, and that in such an emergency as this everyone, in some respect, should patriotically respond to his Nation's call. Those best fitted should raise corn and wheat and oats and potatoes. Others should be in factories making hats, shoes, and clothing. Thousands should be in munition factories to see that all the necessary supplies are forthcoming. Others should be in the various industries of this country. In a war we should all be called to our Nation's service where we can best serve, whether in civil or military life, and we should sacrifice all upon the altar of our country. [Applause.]

Until I studied the pending bill patiently, I grant that I had deep-seated prejudice against conscription and that I had to fight to overcome this prejudice before I analyzed the pending bill with a clear vision.

I have always believed in a democratic form of government. I believe in equality of citizenship, equality of opportunity, and equality of obligation to the Government, both civil and military. We have provided a fund of \$7,000,000,000 with which to conduct this war, and we are not going to raise this huge sum of money by voluntary contributions. Nobody believes this would be fair. No one has suggested it. Yet I submit that it is as fair to rely upon voluntary contributions to support this war financially as it is to rely upon voluntary enlistments. The wealth of this country should largely pay the financial burden of this great war, and it will pay it, but it will pay it by a system of taxation enacted by this Congress. Let us call it financial conscription. No one will feel disgraced because he is called upon to pay his share of taxes under an act of Congress, and no one should feel that there is any disgrace attached to his joining the Army under this bill providing for universal military service, which applies to all alike.

I deeply deplore this war; everyone does. But now that we are in it I have made up my mind to stand behind those in charge

of it, and to aid in the enactment of all legislation that will raise the most effective Army in the history of this country. To adopt the majority report is to postpone conscription. This report begs the question. The Members who wrote it had no confidence in it. They knew that it was doomed to failure. The people of this country will not be deceived. If they had been certain of their ground, if anyone in this House feels that the volunteer system is going to be a success, and he thinks it is fair and should be enacted into law, then he would not be justified in providing a substitute in the same bill. When the substitute provision was incorporated, it was an admission that the other would fail, and that the selective system would have to be ultimately resorted to. In other words, it was conscription postponed.

In the meantime our people would be torn by dissension, the Government would be humiliated at home and abroad, our allies in this common cause would be distrustful, and the common enemy that we are fighting would be encouraged. The best way to bring this war to a successful conclusion is not to hesitate in the appropriation of an adequate amount of money, the raising of an effective Army, and the supplying of the Army and the Navy with arms and munitions. Let us strike now, before some of our allies are torn with internal dissension and a separate peace is made. Let us lend them heart and courage, and when this war is concluded let it not be said that the flag of our country was ever lowered in defeat.

I am not on the Military Committee nor have I had occasion heretofore to make a close study of military matters. It does not, however, need a military man to know that the selective draft system is a shorter, quicker, and surer method of raising an efficient Army. All the military authorities are for the selective draft system. The Secretary of War favors it, and all the Army men advocate it. The President, who is charged with the grave responsibility of conducting this war to a successful conclusion, after having for months conferred with those in a position to know, insists upon the universal military liability system.

In this emergency I am not going to weaken the President, but I am going to uphold his hands. I sincerely hope that this war will be brought to a successful conclusion in the very near future without any American boy being taken across the sea as a soldier; but I insist that if it becomes necessary in the defense of the lives of our citizens and the flag of this Nation to raise an army and some of our people of military age should be required to join it and render service, no loyal, patriotic American father or mother, can blame me if I vote for a law that applies to all without distinction. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, after 30 years of economic and military preparation the German autocracy seized on the assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his duchess, heirs to the throne of Austria, by a pan Slavic patriot in Sarajevo, Bosnia, on June 28, 1914, as an excuse for starting a world war which had for years been premeditated and which Germany started August 1, 1914. From the very beginning the German Government has trampled under foot every principle of international law and every rule of civilized warfare. In violation of a solemn treaty obligation she invaded Belgium and contemptuously referred to that treaty as a scrap of paper. She devastated the country and murdered women and children and said it was due to the exigencies of war. In her submarine warfare she has even sunk Red Cross boats without warning. Her accredited agents in the United States have been responsible for dynamite outrages. The Zimmermann note to Mexico and Japan is an indication of how far Germany will go in her desperation. If the European war in which we are now an ally succeeds in eliminating the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs, those modern representatives of medievalism in government, it may be worth all the blood and treasure that has been and will be spilled and spent in prosecuting it to a successful issue. I had hoped that we could have maintained to the end an honorable neutrality and kept out of the war, but it was not to be. We stood insult after insult and violation after violation of our rights by the Imperial German Government until our attitude was misconstrued and Germany thought we were too proud or too cowardly to fight. We most certainly demonstrated to the world that we are a patient and long-suffering people and that we will only resort to war as a last recourse. But that has always been our policy. We have never prosecuted a war but in defense of liberty, human rights, national honor and national integrity. When necessary we will always fight in defense and in offense for any of them. In ancient times it used to be said

that Carthage could fight to its last dollar, but Rome would fight to its last man. The United States will fight for the right to its last man and its last dollar. [Applause.]

There are worse things than war. No people ever attained liberty but by the sword, and no people ever retained liberty any longer than they possessed the power, the ability, the courage, and the patriotism to defend it with the sword. Our country was born of blood, was baptized with blood, and was saved and cemented by the shedding of blood.

While the desire for liberty is as old as the aspirations of the human heart for higher and better conditions, the liberty we enjoy is a new thing in government and dates practically from the Revolutionary War. It is the result of the best thought and the best efforts of the best minds that have inhabited and benefited the earth by right living and exalted thinking. It cost unnumbered precious lives and untold treasure. It is our obligation to transmit it to posterity as pure as we received it from the founders and preservers of the Republic, who suffered so much and who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor that they and we might be free. Freedom is not the natural state of man. It can not be conferred on a people by a constitution, by statute law, or by a declaration of independence. A republic is the highest expression of the evolution of government. It took our branch of the human race thousands of years to develop to the government-by-the-people stage of civilization. Such a government can only be maintained by a moral and intelligent and a courageous people who are willing, when necessary, to fight and to die in defense of the nation's rights and honor and independence and in defense of human liberty. We are in such a war now.

For the German Government and the frightfulness of German militarism I have the utmost abhorrence, but for the German people I have the highest regard and sincerest sympathy. They are a moral, frugal, home-loving, God-fearing people. Some of our best citizens are Germans and of German descent. It is but natural that when the war was confined to Europe they should have sympathized with Germany, but now that the United States is in the war I feel certain, knowing them as I do, that 99 per cent of our citizens of German blood will be loyal and true to their flag and their country—the star-spangled red, white, and blue and the United States. [Applause.] In these trying times, when democracy and autocracy are engaged in a life-and-death struggle, we are Americans all, in heart and mind and soul and thought and deed. We will all do all in our power to assist in bringing the war to a speedy and successful conclusion, but in the excitement caused by the war the peoples' representatives must be careful not to enact legislation that will create a centralized autocratic power that may be dangerous to American institutions and to American liberty. I voted for the resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the United States and the Imperial German Government. I voted for the appropriations for the Army and Navy and for the \$7,000,000,000 bond issue to prosecute the war. I am willing and ready to vote for more when necessary. I want to see the war prosecuted to a successful termination at as early a date as possible. To accomplish that we must raise and equip an army as expeditiously as we can. There are honest differences of opinion as to how this can best be done.

Personally I believe we should and could raise a volunteer army of 500,000 or 1,000,000 men quicker than we could by conscripting them, and we should immediately, in the same bill that provides for volunteers, adopt the Swiss system of universal training and universal service, modified to meet the different conditions caused by the great extent of the territory of the United States. This is not conscription. It is a recognition of the principle of universal obligation divested of favoritism, and it retains the home unit in the Army. Every great commander from the beginning of history has recognized the superiority of a volunteer to a conscript. They always call for volunteers for any extra hazardous and dangerous enterprise.

The volunteer and the conscript both have to be trained after they enter the service before they can make good soldiers. But the patriotic, willing volunteer can be trained into a good soldier much quicker than can the unwilling conscript. Neither Canada nor Australia has resorted to conscription, and I do not think we should do so without giving the volunteer system a chance in the same bill in which we provide for conscription if necessary.

I shall vote for the committee bill, but if that is voted down I shall vote for the bill as it is presented to the House for final passage, even though it should, contrary to my judgment, eliminate the volunteer system and provide for raising an army by the selective draft.

All of the wars in which our country has been engaged have been fought to a successful issue by volunteers.

During the Civil War, at the beginning of 1862, we had 637,000 volunteers under arms, and the Secretary of War discontinued recruiting. Under the act of March, 1863, 1,369,343 soldiers joined the Union Army, and of that number only 61,947 were drafted men. After six months' training and service no better soldiers ever trod the face of the earth than the men in the Union and Confederate Armies. I can not sit quietly in my seat and permit them to be traduced and their achievements belittled by theorists.

There is at the present time in the War Department a card-indexed list of 11,000 veterans of the Spanish-American War who have passed the physical and mental examination for officers on the reserve list of the Army. There are living to-day 245,000 veterans of the Spanish-American and Philippine Wars, over 100,000 of whom are under 40 years old, and there are in the United States 100,000 Greeks who saw service in two Balkan wars. At least 100,000 of the veterans of those wars would undoubtedly volunteer if given a chance, but under the selective draft they would all be exempt from the draft and prohibited by their age from enlisting in the Regular Army. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am quite sure that very few people here will agree with me, but that will not prevent me from saying what I intend to say. The situation seems to be somewhat confused not only in the minds of the Members of Congress but in the minds of the people. It is very likely that the people are behind the President, but they are so far behind him that they do not know exactly where he stands right now, and they do not quite understand what he is calling upon them to fight for. One man out of every twenty thousand of fighting age has enlisted since the 2d day of April. Does that mean that out of every 20,000 men there are 19,999 cowards, or does it mean that the great masses of the people fail to understand the sudden change which has taken place in the international policy of the country? You must realize that the great masses of the people refuse to volunteer because they have not grasped the full significance of what has happened, because they have not grown up to the new international policy of the President, because they do not understand what it means to be asked to fight for democracy in Germany or Austria-Hungary and Turkey and Bulgaria so as to fix the boundary lines between contending European nations. Because they do not understand this change of international policy men talk about conscription, about coercion, about force, and duress. Is not this very fact, that up to the present moment 1 out of 20,000 has volunteered a conclusive argument against the policy of conscription? Is not an opportunity to volunteer a sort of a referendum?

On the 6th day of December, 1915, I introduced a resolution calling upon the President to convene a congress of neutral nations and that the following be made the basis of international peace: The liberation of oppressed nationalities, a referendum for Poland, Alsace-Lorraine, and Finland, the establishment of an international court of arbitration, concerted disarmament, and the adoption of the commercial boycott as a substitute for war and as a means of punishing recalcitrant nations. That was on the 6th day of December, 1915. The Committee on Foreign Affairs had an interesting hearing, which lasted two days, but nothing was done with that socialist resolution. It was a socialist resolution laying down the basis of international peace. What do we find on the 2d of April, 1917? The President of the United States not only adopts that resolution in toto, but asks the people of the United States to fight for it, so that I am the conservative and he is the radical. I merely talk internationalism, while he wants you to fight for it. What does he say? He says:

We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included—

Notice that word "peoples," the plural, which may be a suggestion of the breaking up of the German Empire—

for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

This noble proclamation of internationalism is not understood by the people. They do not quite know what the President is talking about. They have heretofore not been called

upon to fight for the liberation of any oppressed nationality anywhere in the world. Is not that really the trouble, and can it be cured by conscription? Can it be cured by compulsion? Can it be cured by forced recruiting? Is it not a question of a wider knowledge, of a deeper understanding of things? As between the minority and the majority report, like between most propositions in this Congress, a Socialist finds himself between the devil and the deep blue sea. I find myself in that position very often as between you Republicans and Democrats. There is no really essential difference between the two reports. What does the majority report say? We will compel you to serve if you do not volunteer. What does the minority report say? We will compel you right now to serve. You are deceiving yourselves, gentlemen; you are trying to embalm your own conscience. You are putting to sleep your own doubts. You know that you are really advocating conscription, but you throw the burden of it on the President so that you will be safe in your districts. [Laughter and applause.] I voted against the war resolution. I would vote against it to-day, in spite of the press and in spite of the whole world, if my vote were the only vote; and I would vote to-day for the revocation of that resolution. I did not vote, however, against the bond issue for the simple reason that my sympathies are in the main with the cause of the allies, and I believe that we should render them every form of noncombatant aid. I do favor the loaning of billions of dollars, if necessary, to the allies, but if you help them, let your help be real and genuine. What do you do? You loan them money, and then take it back from them in excessive profits. The shipping interests, according to an article in a conservative paper—the New York Times—make as much as 1,600 per cent profit on ships, and when you give a fellow a dollar and then charge him sixteen times as much for the article you sell to him you really only give him six cents, do you not?

I would not only loan money, not only help with food and every form of material, but I would protect them against exploitation by American capital. I would protect them against exploitation by the munition interests. I would seize all the munition factories and make them Government property and squeeze the profits out of the munition business for the protection of the people of the United States as well as for the protection of the allies. [Applause.] I would take hold of the basic industries of the country and put them on a national basis, on a democratic basis, and lay the foundation for a democratic management of industries, one thing that is inevitable and that is bound to come. I would conscript wealth and not men. We talk about German efficiency. Do you people realize what this fight means? Do you know that before 1914 Germany had 10,000,000 of men trained to fight, and do you really believe that you can raise an army large enough to become a factor on the European battle fields? Why, you are wasting time here. By the time you raise your army the war will be over. How will you transport a million and a half men? You will have to build several dozen bridges across the Atlantic Ocean or you will have to do what my ancestor did when he struck with his staff the Red Sea, and in that way permit your army to walk across the Atlantic Ocean. [Applause.]

And then it is wrong from the standpoint of international peace for the American people to encourage the idea that the war should last another year and a half. You will never be called upon to fight, and the reason the people do not volunteer is that they fear that they may be called upon to fight in the trenches, fight for something they do not understand. They do not know a thing about international diplomacy. Most of the people do not know whether Hamburg is in Switzerland or in Palestine. They are not going to fight for intangible things. Had Germany been foolish enough to send a submarine to fire a few shots at an American port the people of the United States would have been aroused, but you can not arouse them by international ideas, by the ideal of international peace, which is my ideal, except that I would not shed blood for it. I believe it can be obtained only by a wider knowledge, by a deeper sympathy, by more education. Germany is strong not only because she is following Napoleon, who was the first to take advantage of the conscript system and then march triumphant over Europe. Germany is powerful not only because she has a conscripted army compelled to fight, forced to fight, and it is, by the way, that very conscript army that destroyed the effort of the social democracy for peace, but Germany is powerful because she occupies contiguous territory with uninterrupted railroad communications. Out of this war there will come in all probability a stronger Germany, because the really sick man of Europe is Austria-Hungary. It will be Austria-Hungary that will be broken up and the German part of Austria-Hungary will ally itself to Germany.

The President asks us to become revolutionists and organize a revolution in Germany. Well, there are better Democrats in Germany than there are here. Germany has millions of social Democrats. They are doing their work for democracy. When they spoke for international peace they were told to stand by the Kaiser, and some people tell us here to stand by the President, whether he moves forward or backward, whether he is right or wrong. He calls upon the people of the United States to become revolutionists. Did you ever hear of conscripting a revolutionist? They talk about conscription as being a democratic institution. Yes; so is a cemetery. [Laughter.] Everybody is a conscript in a cemetery. [Applause.] It is the democracy of the cemetery and the equality of the slaughterhouse. [Applause.] The volunteer immolates himself on the altar of liberty for an ideal, for an aspiration, for a principle. He fights, and in fighting for an idea a man lives. There is nothing nobler than to fight for something when it is a matter of choice, of impulse, of fervor, of enthusiasm, when it springs from your heart, from within your own breast. That is the case with the volunteer, with the man who gives his life for what he believes to be a cause worth fighting for. The volunteer is a rebel, a fighter for freedom, a martyr. A conscript is a lamb led to the slaughter, a victim. Is not that true?

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I will yield a little later, when I develop my argument. I will yield to the gentleman in a few minutes. I said the war will not last long enough. It is wrong for us to encourage the thought that it will. New Russia was called upon recently to assure the world that she did not contemplate a separate peace with Germany. A separate peace between new Russia and Germany would have been a calamity to the world, and the Russian social democracy announced that they would fight for universal peace, although this war was not of their making, but they would continue to fight for universal peace provided no indemnities and no annexations were demanded.

The German social democracy insists now that the German Government should waive all claims to indemnity and annexation. The President says we want no indemnity and no annexation. What are we fighting for? These are the questions that disturb people's minds, the minds of intelligent men who are confronted with the problem of volunteering. They want to know why. They want to know what for.

The European peoples will be liberated not by an outside force, but by the force of the revolutionary elements of Europe. In every country of Europe the people will demand an accounting, and an explanation, and a reason, the why and the wherefore of this war. The wave of rebellion is coming. That is why I look upon this talk about raising an army and deceiving the people into the belief that you are not conscripting them because you give them a chance to volunteer before they are conscripted as so much wasted time.

Tell the truth! The truth is that both bills mean conscription. And the majority and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs yielded to the pressure of the White House and have surrendered their judgment in good old Democratic style. Yes; whenever the President sneezes the Democrats on the floor of this House wipe their noses every time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. In case the number of men required would volunteer there would not be any conscription under this majority report, would there?

Mr. LONDON. Of course, if there should be sufficient volunteers there would be no conscription. That is true. It is a little better than nothing.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman from New York and his socialist friends are against conscription. If Congress should pass a volunteer bill would there be a wild rush from the Socialists to fight for their country?

Mr. LONDON. There would not be a bigger rush from the Socialists than from the membership of this Congress.

Mr. JAMES. I want to say that a good many Members of this House have enlisted once, and will be enlisted again.

Mr. LONDON. The only man that I will believe will enlist will talk to me in uniform.

Mr. JAMES. Then you will never have a Socialist talk to you.

Mr. LONDON. The Socialists have been fighting for democracy while every corporation lawyer in the ranks of other parties has been serving the capitalists against the working people. We have been the fighters for liberty throughout the world. We have been the fighters for international peace. Our men and

women have voluntarily gone to the jails, to exile, and to the scaffold fighting for democracy, and it is cowardice on the part of anybody to accuse the Socialists of lack of courage.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the United States in taking the stand she has is going to fight for the protection of the lives of women and little children?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, but the President is nobler than that.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. LONDON. I did answer it. The President speaks for the people of the United States, and he does not speak in a spirit of revenge. Oh, no. He says that we shall fight this war without rancor, without selfish objects, seeking nothing for ourselves. The gentleman has not grown up to the President's policy. [Laughter.]

Is there any other question? I will extend my remarks by coordinating these different subjects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I understand the gentleman to say that he thought this war would be over at the end of six months.

Mr. LONDON. I do not believe you can organize the Army in six months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. You think the war will be over before the Army will be organized?

Mr. LONDON. I think by the time this Army is organized the war will be over. I am quite confident of it, because I have faith in the awakened democratic forces in Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY]. [Applause.]

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I happen to be not a recent convert of the doctrine of universal military service. I welcome those whom I find in the ranks to-night for that democratic institution. The best answer that I can give to the critics of universal military service is that in our work for the Nation in a war sense we should consider ourselves not a confederation but a nation. I take it for granted that the biggest objection that comes to the conscription idea is the fact that men can not be associated in units for the purpose of fighting, and that one man who knows another in a particular locality or community may for the moment be dissociated from his fellow. That is too sentimental a proposition for me in a military sense. I believe that war is a cold, merciless proposition, and to be successful should be devoid of too much sentiment. There is not any question that the volunteer proposition is predicated on sentiment. That proposition is built upon those fine and delicate tendencies that we would look for in pacifism and not in militarism. Efficiency and democracy are associated with the conscription idea, and I wish to say here to the Members to-night that I am unreservedly in favor of any proposition that entails upon the citizenship of the country equal service. [Applause.]

Citizenship does not lie alone in taking what a republic offers. It does not lie alone in gathering the fruits of comfort and of luxury and of good wages and good times. It comes rather in the acknowledgment in the hearts of men that they owe a service, a great service, to the country to which they give their allegiance, and especially to a country of this kind, the greatest republic upon God's footstool. [Applause.] In a crisis such as confronts us, a citizen's obligations are greater than his privileges. In the minority bill we correct the mistakes of the past, and we seek to be guided by the lessons of the present great conflict in Europe.

I will refer for a moment to this statement, and I believe that it can not be contradicted: "Twenty thousand regular troops at Bull Run would have routed the insurgents, settled the question of military resistance, and relieved us from the pain and expense of four years of war." That is what we paid at that time for a policy of unpreparedness. That is what we paid at that time for a policy of pulling sentimentality, for the regard of one man toward another, for that inefficient conduct which goes to create and foster a sentiment rather than to produce results.

Let me refer to another instance:

The slow increase of the Continental Army shows that Congress was committed to a dual military establishment—one class of troops being Continental or regular, the other militia. In the former the gradual extension of enlistments to two or three years enabled the men to acquire the discipline which ultimately proved the salvation of our cause. The natural disposition of men to seek the easiest and shortest service permitted them to enlist in the militia in preference to the Continental regiments, and thus the only force that could be depended upon to cope with the British, both offensively and defensively, was always from one-third to one-half below its prescribed strength.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I regret I can not. My time is too limited. That is dealing with the Revolutionary War. I will refer now to the War of 1812. These things are so important and significant and have to do so much with what we lost at that time through an inefficient policy and the policy of unpreparedness that I wish to incorporate some extracts in these remarks of mine. I read:

The failure of Congress, at the beginning of the war, to declare in favor of territorial recruitment and obligatory service affords another result equally striking. The Army voted in January, 1812, was 35,000; the number of inexperienced officers ultimately called out and whose average pay was at least four times that of the private soldier was 33,481.

Instead of falling upon the 5,000 British regulars who held Canada at the beginning and crushing them in a single battle, we allowed them to baffle every attempt at invasion, and to prolong the war until our loss in killed and wounded numbered 5,614.

In contrast with our reckless extravagance in employing more than a half million of men, the largest force of British regulars opposed to us was 16,500.

These figures, \$198,000,000, which do not embrace the millions paid for pensions since 1823, may be accepted with slight variation as the immediate cost of the war.

Had Congress from 1808 to 1811 applied one-fourth of this sum to the maintenance of an army of 15,000 men, so organized as to have been capable of expansion by the aid of voluntary enlistments and obligatory service to double or triple its numbers, there is little reason to doubt that Canada would have been ours and the war brought to a close on a single campaign.

Canada would have been ours, and our flag would have waved from the far North to the Gulf of Mexico. It had been the dream of many an American spirit. Think of that great loss, think of that great sacrifice, through unpreparedness!

Now men shudder at the name "conscript." We need not be afraid of names. My Socialist friend, Mr. LONDON, says it is the conscription that leads to the democracy of the cemetery. Well, brave men need not be afraid of death, no matter where it occurs. But I plead for that democracy which entails equal service upon all, and I plead with all the vigor of my manhood, with every man in this Chamber, with every man throughout the country, for the equal-service principle. The man whose son is summoned to the colors, to stand by the honor of the country and to preserve its sacred institutions, is right when he says that that same obligation should rest equally as well upon the shoulders of the son of the man next door and of his neighbor. [Applause.]

What better argument do we want than that the best blood of the Nation should not be drained? Is it not futile to take the cream, if you please, of the population and leave the skimmed milk? We will be better off and, if my Socialist friend from New York is a good prophet when he says that the war will be over in six months, we will have as the result of our preparation a splendid lesson in military preparedness, 1,000,000 men standing erect, having learned the lesson that military preparation gives—that leaven with which to build up a new country and to instill into the hearts of our citizens a greater, a bigger, a broader patriotism; yea, more, a deeper devotion to the flag, and a readiness to sacrifice one's life for one's country. [Applause.]

Now, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the consolidation of our heterogeneous elements into a more composite whole must be the result of our war with Germany, otherwise we will have fought largely in vain. A greater and more united Nation reflecting democracy's hopes, and centering the eyes of all upon a common flag should result and be handed down to generations yet unborn as a glorious heritage. The war was clarified by the elimination of autocratic Russia and the substitution of democratic Russia. Only smiles were provoked when we associated the Czar with democratic ambitions. President Wilson's address of April 2, 1917, vitalized the war and charged it with the living electric force of democratic thought. "Make room and clear the path for a world democracy" is his slogan. As a result kings are having nightmares, and crowns are rated at a lower figure. The rumblings of to-day will become the revolutions of to-morrow.

How glorious to read of the great reception in Petrograd to the grandmother of the Russian revolution after her 27 years of exile in Siberia. Where royalty was formerly entertained in the special rooms at the railroad station she was acclaimed by the people. The fruits of the early revolutionists were evident, and their sacrifices were glorified.

France has always thrilled us with her inborn love of democracy. Our debt to her for her aid in our Revolutionary War for freedom will never be paid. Her timely aid in men, money, and ships made possible the chapter ending at Yorktown. I was gratified to hear my good and learned friend, Mr. MON-

TAGUE, of Virginia, speak up so resolutely for France in this Chamber a few days ago.

He left one thing unsaid: The splendid service rendered by the Irish soldiers commanded by Count Dillon under Rochambeau; another Irish regiment commanded by Capt. Walsh likewise did their part, both at the siege of Savannah and at Yorktown. I speak of the great number of Irishmen in the French Army under Rochambeau, in addition to those enrolled in the militia and continental forces. For 100 years from the capitulation of Limerick to the days of the French Revolution the Irish exiles had fought for France. History teems with their gallant deeds. I need but mention Fontenoy. Gen. Anthony Wayne, the son of an Irishman, and Stony Point are inseparably linked. Gen. Daniel Morgan, another son of an Irishman, and his great victory at the Cowpens will never be forgotten. Gen. Henry Knox's hard travel to Lake Champlain for guns for the Revolutionary Army will always stamp him the possessor of Celtic blood and the darling so dear to the heart of Washington.

To the name of John Barry, the Irishman, will be forever attached "The First Commodore of the American Navy" and the commander of the first vessel of war that captured a British war vessel. The name of Gen. Richard Montgomery, of Donegal, Ireland, will forever ring in the ears of patriots as the man who gave his life for the revolution in escalating the Heights of Quebec before the Declaration of Independence was given to the world. So France and America are linked in this war for democratic ideals. What shall we say of Great Britain? The past is not the present. The future is made brighter by hope and not despair. I know England has liberal-minded sons who would do justice to Ireland. I know her statesmen have made generous improvements in the land laws of Ireland and given an impetus to a peasant proprietary. These reforms are but a modicum of justice. What horrible incubus grips her Government to-day in withholding a full measure of self-government to Ireland?

The American people love liberty; they want it not alone for themselves but for other peoples throughout the world. They long to see the day of Belgium's restoration; they will shout with very joy for Poland's reincarnation. We pray that everywhere the sovereign power will be lodged with the people, and that kings and their empty ceremonies will be set aside. Great Britain has a great chance to popularize this war. Let her be as democratic as the United States and France; let her be fair to Ireland. Forthwith give her freedom, and an admiring world will applaud. If, perchance, self-government should be denied Ireland until the close of the war, let me as an unadulterated American and a lover of liberty and freedom express the hope in this American Congress that when the representatives of the belligerent nations shall sit at the table to arrange the terms of peace it shall fall to the lot of our representatives to say a word for that Emerald Isle which has been oppressed for centuries. Let that word and action taken by America's representatives be the means of realizing the wish of that youthful patriot, Robert Emmet, who asked that his epitaph be not written until Ireland had taken her place among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have agreed to adjourn at 10 o'clock to-night, and in view of the fact that I intended to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], and that he could not finish his speech by 10 o'clock, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. MOON for several days on account of important business.

INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a telegram from Hon. John H. Morehead, for two terms governor of Nebraska and candidate for Vice President, the telegram being in reference to matters which are now at issue.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

FALLS CITY, NEBR., April 24, 1917.

HON. ASHTON C. SHALLENBERGER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Conscription for Army service unpopular and should be used only as a last resort for national defense. Conscription for European service exceedingly unpopular. My associations such that I know the sentiment of the rank and file. No measure so unpopular during my lifetime as drafting our boys for European service. Let those go who are willing to volunteer 's the unanimous verdict.

JOHN H. MOREHEAD.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, and that the pending bill (H. R. 3545) be considered in general debate under the same agreement as heretofore.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, and that general debate shall proceed under the rule we have been proceeding under for two or three days.

Mr. MANN. That means that the bill will not be read for amendment to-morrow?

Mr. DENT. No.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman does not now ask to close general debate?

Mr. DENT. I do not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 26, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting tentative draft of a provision of legislation relating to the precedence of officers of the Navy (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Dry Straits, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Missouri River from the city of Florence, Nebr., to the northern limits of Decatur, Nebr. (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Coquille River, Oreg., from Coquille City to the entrance (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WEBB, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 291) to punish acts of interference with foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States; to punish espionage and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 30), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 3806) to grant citizenship to all aliens who have filed first papers and who have enlisted in the Army or Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3807) to increase the pay of all officers and men in the military forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 3808) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission for the relocation and rebuilding of dams across navigable rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 3809) to indemnify the city of New York for expenses incurred in defense of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 3810) to repeal the literacy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) to provide for the naturalization of certain aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 3823) for completing improvements of the Port Henry Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) creating a commission to report a plan for the adoption of a national budget system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Julia P. Overacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 3813) granting a pension to William D. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3814) granting a pension to Peter Kanuk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3815) granting a pension to Joseph J. Shane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3816) granting an increase of pension to William R. Gillispie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 3817) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wharton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 3818) granting a pension to Emille Louise Feely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 3819) granting a pension to Irving Wohl; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 3820) for the relief of Charles A. Carey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3821) granting a pension to Thomas E. Rector; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Kessinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 3824) to reinstate Frederick J. Birkett as third lieutenant in the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 3825) for the relief of Oscar Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 3826) granting an increase of pension to Levi Vandervort; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Republican County Committee of the County of New York, pledging loyalty and support to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of American Society of Civil Engineers, favoring universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., against excise tax on corn sirup or glucose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. S. Ohriner, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against stamp tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of board of representatives of Federal Employees' Union, favoring bill for retirement of superannuated Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Republican Club of the City of New York, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, pledging support to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in re raw supplies after the war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of board of directors of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petitions of sundry churches of the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of State Board of Education of New Jersey, favoring the Federal staff bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of James Eastwood and others, of Paterson, N. J., favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Republican Club of the City of New York, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of board of representatives of Federal Employees' Union, favoring bill for retirement of superannuated Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Bishop Allgyer and others of West Liberty, Ohio, against universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Illinois Club of Chicago and committee on engineering cooperation, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of board of representatives of the Federal Employees' Union, favoring passage of Senate bill 281, for retirement law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Military Engineering Committee of New York, asking that all new units of engineer troops be organized by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of St. Botolph Club, Boston, Mass., pledging support to the Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Memorial of State Board of Education of New Jersey, favoring the Federal Staff bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KREIDER: Memorials of Congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Mechanicsburg, and Park Street United Evangelical Church, of Harrisburg, Pa., favoring national prohibition during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of 500 women of Oneida, N. Y., favoring the adoption of an antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Republican Club of New York City, favoring universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of Northwestern Ohio Conference of the Church of the Brethren, asking exemption from military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of Crookston (Minn.) Lodge, No. 64, Sons of Hermann, pledging its loyalty to the flag of the United States, their adopted country, and support of the country in whatever way they may be called upon to do in the present crisis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Thief River Falls (Minn.) Lodge, of U. C. T. of A., pledging the loyalty and support of that branch of the society in the war against Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Commercial Club of Fergus Falls, Minn., urging governmental regulation of grain and other foodstuff prices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of Grace Evangelical Lutheran Church, Leechburg, Pa., favoring closing of distilleries and breweries in the interest of our national food supply; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 193 citizens of Marion Center and vicinity, Pa., favoring national prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of sundry citizens of Randolph, Mass., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARD: Petition indorsed by Presbytery of Columbia County, N. Y., favoring establishment of Federal motion-picture commission; forbidding of interstate transmission of race-gambling bets; sectarian appropriations; Sunday-rest law for District of Columbia; uniform marriage and divorce law; and prohibition measures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of Arthur J. Wellington and 15 other residents of Rindge, N. H., favoring the principle of universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Congregational Church and Christian Endeavor Society of Canterbury, N. H., favoring an effective method to prohibit the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. W. Snow and 19 other residents of Whitefield, N. H., favoring an effective method to prohibit the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George I. Putnam and 28 other residents of Charlestown, N. H., favoring legislation which provides for the application of the principle of universal service in the raising of our national-defense forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the East Concord (N. H.) Congregational Church, favoring nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Baptist Sunday School of Antrim, N. H., favoring nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fred A. Dunlap and 38 other residents of Antrim, N. H., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the citizens of New London, N. H., in mass meeting assembled, favoring universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Frank L. McVey, president of University of North Dakota, and others, advocating the raising of money by taxation rather than by bond issues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 26, 1917.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 23, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, assumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1871) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, because I am going to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator permit a suggestion by the Chair?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would be very glad to have it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is that he submit the unanimous-consent agreement and then have a roll call to disclose the presence of a quorum. It might not be necessary to call it twice.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will be glad to do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed agreement will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT.

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 1 o'clock p. m., on Friday, April 27, 1917, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 1871, a bill to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, and that at 5 o'clock p. m., on that calendar day, will vote without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill S. 1871, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the said hour of 1 o'clock p. m., on said calendar day, April 27, 1917, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Now, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	McKellar	Simmons
Beckham	Harding	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Brady	Hollis	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Husting	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	James	New	Smoot
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Stone
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Sutherland
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Thomas
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Robinson	Thompson
Fernald	Kellogg	Saulsbury	Townsend
Fletcher	Kirby	Shafroth	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Sheppard	Vardaman
Gallinger	La Follette	Sherman	Watson
Gerry	McCumber	Shields	Williams

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON],